ATTITUDINAL EFFECTS OF A MILITARY ORIENTATION CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY LEADERS

BY

DALE KENDALL PATTERSON

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

(Journalism)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1971

DEDICATION

To Pat and Flip

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the opportunity afforded me by the United States Navy to pursue a program of post-graduate education.

To Captain Vincent C. Thomas, Jr., USNR, Retired, and the personnel of the Directorate for Community Relations, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), whose assistance made the accomplishment of this study possible.

Gratitude is particularly extended to my committee--Professor Douglas C. Jones, who served as my major professor; Professor Harry P. Sharp, who made numerous invaluable suggestions as to concept and method; and Professor Steven H. Chaffee, my thesis adviser and committee chairman, to whom I am especially indebted for his intellectual stimulation and guidance throughout this research effort.

To Urai Somwan, who cheerfully performed the eleventh hour typing of the draft of this work for committee reading.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife, Maureen, for her encouragement and unflagging confidence in me; and to my son, Deke, for his patience and fortitude in living with his ofttimes crabby "student" father.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the opportunity afforded me by the Federal Energy Agency to pursue a program of post-graduate education.

My dissertation director, Dr., Dean, Wesley, and the members of the dissertation for Community Relations, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), have maintained with the accomplishment of this study possible.

Gratitude is particularly extended to my committee: Professor Douglas G. Adams, who served as my major professor; Professor Harry F. Kelly, who made numerous invaluable suggestions as to concept and method; and Professor Steven R. Chatfield, my thesis advisor and committee chairman, to whom I am eternally indebted for his intellectual stimulation and guidance throughout this research effort.

My loyal secretary, who cheerfully performed the alternate tedious typing of the draft of this work, for constantly encouraging.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife, Dorothy, for her encouragement and unflagging confidence in me and to my son, John, for his patience and forbearance in living with his relations during "absentee" fatherhood.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The conduct of and extent of U. S. military public relations in recent years has become subject to increased comment in the public media. Robert Manning, writing in The Atlantic Monthly early in 1970, said: "Senator William Fulbright and his investigators have been asking the right questions and demanding honest answers from the Pentagon. After weeks of persisting, they came up with the calculation that the Pentagon is spending at least $28 million a year on public relations and the promoting of the armed forces." Manning adds, "A lot of those millions . . . are spent for the questionable purpose of persuading us to allocate billions more for the military machinery."[1]

John Kenneth Galbraith has written a book entitled How to Control the Military. In its opening pages he states: "The problem of the military power is not unique; it is merely a rather formidable example of the tendency of organization, in an age of organization, to develop a life

---

[1]Robert Manning, The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 225, No. 2 (February 1970), p. 3.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The conduct of and support of U. S. military policy relations in recent years has been analyzed in understand comment in the public media. Robert Manning, writing in The Atlantic Monthly early in 1970, asks "Kissinger Military Strategist and his Internationalists have been testing the tough questions and challenging Nixon's security from the Pentagon. After years of prediction, they came up with the conclusion that the Pentagon is spending at least one million a year on public relations and the promoting of the broad interests." Manning asks, "A lot of those millions . . . are spent for the questionable purpose of persuading us to allocate billions more for the military establishment."[1]

Jack Raymond additionally has written a book entitled *How to Control the Military*. In his opening paragraphs he states: "The problem of the military power is not military it is merely a rather formidable example of the immaturity of organizations. In an age of organization, to develop a life

---

[1]Robert Manning, "The Atlantic Monthly, vol. 225, no. 3 (February 1971), p. 3.

and purpose and truth of its own."[2]

Following his investigation of military spending for public relations, Senator Fulbright also wrote a book, The Pentagon Propaganda Machine. In criticizing the military services' public relations programs, he wrote:

> Each service has its own civilian tour program, but the most prestigious is the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference--an eight day tour for seventy civilians run by the Office of the Secretary of Defense . . . "Defense dollars"--or better, "taxpayers' dollars"--are lavished on these trips with the expensive might of the military machine put on full-dress display for the civilian visitors. . . .[3]

Senator William Proxmire, another outspoken critic of Pentagon spending, issued a press release in March 1970 in which he called upon the Defense Department to "stop the practice of providing free flights to influential citizens to major military installations for briefing and propaganda purposes."[4] While no reference was made specifically to the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference (JCOC), the implication seemed clear that it was the type of activity to which Proxmire referred.

The JCOC is not a new program. It has been a part of the Defense Department from the beginnings of the

---

[2]John Kenneth Galbraith, How to Control the Military (New York, 1969), p. 16.

[3]J. William Fulbright, The Pentagon Propaganda Machine (New York, 1970), pp. 34-35.

[4]Press Release, Office of Senator William Proxmire, March 22, 1970.

and purpose and kinds of its own.[2]

Following the demobilization of military expanding for public relations, Western Electric also wrote a book, The Bell System Foundation Manual. In criticizing the military activities' public relations programs, he wrote:

> Each service has its own civilian core program, but the most pervasive is the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference—an right day trip for leading civilians run by the Office of the Secretary of Defense . . . "Business Orientation"—or better, "Company" Orientation—has invited six times with the respective major of the military education plan as full-time display the civilian visitors. . . .[3]

Professor William Wyckoff, another neoconservative critic of Pentagon spending, learned a great volume in March 1971 in which he called upon the Defense Department to "stop the practice of spending some fortune to influential citizens to major military institutions for training and propaganda purposes."[4] While no interview was made specifically to the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference (JCOC), the implication seemed clear that it was the type of ministry to which Professor Wyckoff referred.

The JCOC is not a new program. It has been a part of the Defense Department from the inception of the

---

[2]John Kenneth Galbraith, How to Control the Military (New York, 1969), p. 13.

[3]G. William Miller, The Business Establishment (New York, 1970), pp. 14-15.

[4]Frank Eskew, Office of Senator William Proxmire, June 12, 1970.

organization's life. To understand and evaluate its role and/or utility, one must first look at the fundamentals of the practice of public relations by the military.

Clearly, the military does have a responsibility in the public relations arena. As Cutlip and Center point out:

> For their common defense, the people of the United States support a large and expensive military establishment. The armed forces make a heavy drain on the nation's wealth, manpower, and natural resources. Support of this costly military machine will require sacrifices on the part of the American people for the foreseeable future. People must be convinced of the need for paying taxes and having sons drafted. They must have confidence in the spenders and the commanders. It is mandatory, therefore, that the armed forces create public understanding of their mission. /Emphasis theirs./[5]

Cutlip and Center note that the essential part of good community relations by the military is in being "a part of instead of apart from the community." (Emphasis theirs.)[6] While this specific reference is concerned with the military base and the relations of the military personnel assigned to that base with the civilian community in which they reside, it also has a broader application. From a national perspective, it is no less important for the military to be a part of the "community."

---

[5]Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations (3d ed. rev.; Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1964), p. 426.

[6]Ibid., p. 440.

organization's life. The educational and religious institutions play an even larger role as the foundations of the political and public relations of the military.

Finally, the military does have a responsibility in the public relations area. In coping and basic point out:

> For civil-service employees, the people of the United States supports a large and expanding military establishment. The armed forces make a heavy drain on the nation's wealth, resources, and material greatness. Support of this mighty military machine will require sacrifices on the part of the American people for the foreseeable future. People must be convinced of the need for paying taxes and having more dangerous. They must have confidence in the economy and the monetary, as in economics, institutions, also the armed forces public relations responsibilities of their nation. (Emphasis theirs.)[5]

Public and human rights more than the essential part of good community relations by the military is in being "a part of instead of apart from the community." (Emphasis theirs.)[6] Thus the specific relationship is concerned with the military base and the relations of the military personnel employed by that base with the surrounding community in which they reside. It also has a broader implication, from a national perspective. It is in the base commander the military to be a part of the "community."

---

[5]Derek S. Oakley and Allan R. Foster, Effective Public Relations (2d ed. rev.; Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: 1963), p. 128.

[6]Ibid., p. 130.

Viewed as a community relations program, then, the JCOC is an attempt to increase understanding of the defense program of the United States. Its intent is that selected civilian leaders will obtain a comprehensive view of the organization and the missions of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.[7]

"The first step in community relations is to tag the decision makers," according to Cutlip and Center. "Persuasion of these key individuals usually facilitates persuasion of their followers."[8] In this respect, JCOC represents for the military services an effort to enhance community relations on a national level.

An obvious question arises: Is the JCOC an effective program? The purpose of this study is to attempt to answer that question.

---

[7]U. S. Navy Office of Information, U. S. Navy Public Affairs Regulations (Rev. 12-65, Washington, D. C., 1965), p. 159.

[8]Cutlip and Center, op. cit., p. 253.

viewed as a constantly variations principles, that the ROTC is an attempt to increased understanding of the defense policies of the United states. The issues is that national activities leaders will exhibit a comprehensive view of the organization and the elements of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.[7]

"The first step in community relations is to "sell the American public," according to Colonel Joe Carson. "Presentations of films for individuals usually illustrates personnel of their activities."[8] In this respect, ROTC responsible for the military activity to attempt community relations on a personal level.

Of various questions arises, is the ROTC an effective program? The purpose of this study is to answer to answer that question.

---

[7]U. S. Navy Office of Information, U. S. Navy Public Affairs Regulations (Washington: 1965), Washington, D. C., Chapt. 2, p. 129.

[8]Colley and Carson, op. cit., p. 233.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROBLEM

Background

The office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), in August 1948, initiated a program of orientation for selected civilian leaders, the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference (JCOC). The intent of the conference was to "provide top-flight civilian leaders with comprehensive instruction dealing with the coordination and integration of foreign and military policy and with the involvement of the legislative and executive branches of the Government in national defense."[1] By the time JCOC No. 40 was conducted in April 1970, the objectives of the conference were stated as:

> a. To provide the Secretary of Defense with a means of exchanging information on defense matters with leading representatives of the educational, business, labor, religious, professional, and industrial communities of the United States.
>
> b. To create within this group an awareness and understanding of the mission of the Department of Defense and the programs and policies related to the discharge of this mission.

---

[1] Outline of a Joint Course for Selected Civilians, Office of Program Analysis, Munitions Board, U. S. Department of Defense, August 16, 1948, p. 1.

CHAPTER II

[illegible] POLICIES

[illegible]

The office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), in August 1963, initiated a program of [illegible] for selected civilian jobs, the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference (JCOC). The intent of the conference was to "provide top-flight civilian leaders with comprehensive instruction dealing with the organization and [illegible] of foreign and military policy and with the involvement of the legislative and executive branches of the government in national defense."[1] By the time JCOC ended, it was concluded in April 1970, the objectives of the conference were stated as:

> a. To provide the Secretary of Defense with a means of exchanging information on defense matters with leading representatives of the civilian sector, business, labor, religious, professional, and informational communities of the United States.
>
> b. To create within that group an appreciation and understanding of the mission of the Department of Defense and the personnel and policies related to the fulfillment of this mission.

---

[1]Position of a Joint Course for Selected Civilians, Office of Program Analysis, Resources Power, O. S. Department of Defense, August 16, 1963, p. 1.

c. To acquaint this group with the strength and readiness posture of the U. S. Armed Forces through personal observation.[2]

Establishment of the JCOC was based on the assumption that such an experience would acquaint the participants with military problems through personal observation and mutual discussion with military and national leaders, and it was hoped that the participants would return to their respective communities favorably disposed toward the defense establishment. However, in the 22 years that the JCOCs have been conducted as one of the two primary public relations efforts by the Department of Defense (the other being Armed Forces Day), there has not been any research effort to evaluate the results of the program.

Previous Work

There has been a plethora of studies in the area of attitudinal effects of special programs and institutions; well known summaries are those of Joseph T. Klapper and Carl I. Hovland.[3] Such studies are by no means confined to communication effects, and they often fail to show positive

---

[2]Policy Memorandum, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, U. S. Department of Defense, November 25, 1969, p. 1.

[3]Joseph T. Klapper, The Effects of Mass Communication (New York, 1960); Carl I. Hovland, "Effects of the Mass Media of Communication," in Gardner Lindzey, Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), pp. 1062-1103.

c. To organize some group with the authority and qualitative position of the U. S. Postal Service through personal observation.[1]

Certainly, the ADOC was based on the assumption that such an organization would minimize the participants with military problems through personal observation and actual discussion with military and civilian leaders, and it was hoped that the participants would return to their respective communities favorably disposed toward the Airborne activities. However, in the 22 years that the ADOC have been conducted, no one of the two primary policy criterion criterion attained by the Superintendent of Schools (the other being School Board Only), there has not been any research effort to evaluate the results of the program.

Conclusion

There has been a plethora of studies in the area of organizational climate of special programs and institutions well known examples are those of Donald E. Kilpatrick and Paul E. Darlison.[2] Such studies are by no means devoted to communication efforts, and they attempt that to show positive

---

[1]Policy Statement, Institute Secretary of Schools for Public Affairs, U. S. Department of Defense, November 22, 1969, p. 1.

[2]Joseph V. Klapper, The Effects of Mass Communication (New York, 1960); Paul E. Darlison, "Effects of the Mass Media of Communication," in Reader Library, Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), pp. 1043-1123.

effects of communication programs. While not specifically applicable to this research effort, these studies in the general area of attitude change were valuable to this researcher in formulating the study.

In an analysis of the persistence of attitudes, Rochester found that statistical comparisons of ". . . the 1967 findings with the 1964 test results indicated that the . . . attitudes present two years after the end of the institute were comparable to those attitudes present at the start of the institute, 1964."[4] And, although the JCOC is not an information program analogous to the Cincinnati campaign[5] or the California gubernatorial candidate's telethon,[6] there does seem to be present some of the same characteristics as in those studies, which found no appreciable effect of the communication effort. The Defense Department certainly expects a positive change or a reinforcement of attitudes among the JCOC participants. But, Hyman and Sheatsley concluded that information is not

---

[4]Dean E. Rochester, "Persistence of Attitudes and Values of NDEA Students - Two Years Post Institute," Counselor Education and Supervision, 9:205-207 (Spring 1970).

[5]Shirley A. Star and Helen MacGill Hughes, "A Report on an Educational Campaign: The Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations," American Journal of Sociology, 55:389-400 (1950).

[6]Wilbur Schramm and Richard F. Carter, "Effectiveness of a Political Telethon," Public Opinion Quarterly, 23:121-126 (1959).

efforts of communication programs. While not specifically applicable to this research effort, these studies in the general area of marketing change were valuable in this research in determining the scope.

In an analysis of the performance of institutions, Hackamer found that evaluational comparisons of "a . . . the last decision when the time lag allowed institutional that the . . . evaluations consider the years after the end of the institution were considered to show activities product in the years of the institution. 1964."[6] And, although the effort is not an information program analogous to the discussion "degree"[7] or the distinction phenomenological evaluations relations,[8] there does seem to be general case of the more quantitative as in terms evaluation, which focus on appreciable effect of the communication effort. The various independent variability requires a positive change in a relationship of activities among the DDDC participants. And, Green and Wheatley concluded that information is one

---

[6]John E. Hackamer, "Evaluations of Activities and Values of DDDA Programs - Two Year Over Duplicate," Counselor Education and Supervision, 4:220-227 (Spring 1970).

[7]Stanley A. Kaye and Philip Merrill Engel, "A Degree as an Educational Campaign: The Clientele, Plus the Educational Analysis," Journal of Education 23:300-400 (1969).

[8]Alice Johnson and Richard A. Cortes, "Alienation: Sign of a Polluted Society," Public Opinion Quarterly 34:121-126 (1970).

a preponderant factor in changing attitudes in a predictable direction.[7] Further, Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee in their election study suggest a curvilinear relationship, in that the more knowledgeable voter is firmer in his opinion and predisposed to vote a certain way; yet the direction of his predilection cannot be predicted from his level of information.[8] There is also experimental evidence that "the more one learns, the greater the magnitude of the attitude change will be--*in either direction*."[9] Smith, Bruner, and White posit that some opinions are so deeply rooted in the holder's personality that they are practically impossible to change.[10] And others suggest that any attitude change first requires a "predisposition to change."[11] Recently, however, Douglas, *et al.*, in a study conducted in two Wisconsin communities, found a "positive

---

[7]Herbert H. Hyman and Paul B. Sheatsley, "Some Reasons Why Information Campaigns Fail," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 11:412-423 (1947).

[8]Bernard B. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William N. McPhee, *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign* (Chicago, 1954).

[9]Bradley S. Greenberg, "On Relating Attitude Change and Information Gain," *Journal of Communication*, 14:157-171 (1964).

[10]M. Brewster Smith, Jerome S. Bruner and Robert W. White, *Opinions and Personality* (New York, 1956).

[11]Joseph T. Klapper, "The Social Effects of Mass Communication," in Wilbur Schramm (ed.), *The Science of Human Communication* (New York, 1963), pp. 69-70.

a prejudicial factor in changing attitudes in a predictable direction.[7] Prejudice, particularly, and perhaps in their election study, suggest a divisive influence, in that the more knowledgeable voter is firmer in his opinion and predisposed to vote a certain way, yet the direction of his predisposition cannot be predicted from the level of information.[8] There is also experimental evidence that "the more one learns, the greater the magnitude of the attitude change will be--in either direction."[9] Hovland, Janis, and Kelley point that some opinions are so deeply rooted in the holder's personality that they are practically impossible to change.[10] And studies suggest that an attitude change will involve a "predisposition to change."[11] Luszki, however, Cooper, et al., in a study conducted in two Midwestern communities, found a "positive

---

[7]Gaudet H. Tyson and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "How Persons Are Influenced Campaign Propaganda Vol.," Public Opinion Quarterly, 11(417-419 (1947).

[8]Bernard R. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William N. McPhee, Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign (Chicago, 1954).

[9]Harold H. Kelley, "Communication and Persuasion" Journal of Communication, 1(1)(7-11 (1951).

[10]C. Hovland Irving L. Janis, Harold H. Kelley, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven, 1953).

[11]Joseph F. Kapner, "The Social Effects of Mass Communication," in Wilbur Schramm (ed.), The Science of Mass Communication (New York, 1960), pp. 43-73.

correlation between information gain and attitude" on the topic of mental retardation.[12]

While there has been very little research conducted with respect to U. S. Defense Department programs, there was a study in 1966 of the Navy Guest Cruise Program (which served as the inspiration for JCOC) by Claude E. Mounce at Boston University.[13] His findings, however, are limited by two factors. First, there was no control or comparison group in his study. And, second, his measurement was restricted to "after only" scores since the "before" measure utilized was retrospective, i.e., "What do you think your attitude was before the cruise?" In all, then, this study has been conducted in a near-vacuum, so far as any empirical literature is concerned.

Research Hypotheses

The general research hypothesis is that from before to after JCOC the participants become more favorably disposed toward the military. This should be manifested in corresponding changes in knowledge, attitudes, opinion, and

---

[12]Dorothy F. Douglas, Bruce H. Westley and Steven H. Chaffee, "An Information Campaign That Changed Community Attitudes," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 479-487+.

[13]Claude E. Mounce, "An Analysis of the Secretary of the Navy Guest Cruise Program" (Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Public Communication, Division of Public Relations, Boston University, 1966).

correlation between information gain and attitude[12] on the topic of medical marijuana.

While there has been very little research conducted with respect to U. S. Science Education programs, there was a study in 1969 of the Harvard Summer Institute (which served as the inspiration for ISCS) by Glenda S. Bowen at Boston University.[13] His findings, however, are limited by two factors. First, there was no control or comparison group in his study. And, second, his measurement was restricted to "Have only" scores about the "Science" measure utilized was retrospective, i.e., "What do you think your attitude was before the course?" In all, then, this study has been conducted in a post-review, so has no any significant literature is reviewed.

Research Hypothesis

The general research hypothesis is that time before to after ASSC the participants become more favorably disposed toward the military. This should be manifested in corresponding changes in knowledge, attitudes, opinion, and

---

[12] Beverly P. Hudson, Simon M. Mabry and Steven E. Gordon, "An Intervention Composite Test Measuring Community Attitudes," Educational Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 419-427.

[13] Glenda S. Bowen, "An Analysis of the Summer of the Early Years Science Program" (Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Public Communication, Division of Media Relations, Boston University, 1981).

overt behavior. While the literature reviewed does not point unequivocally to positive predictions, all of the hypotheses are phrased in positive terms for purposes of testing:

1. Information Gain. The extent of knowledge about the military services possessed by the participants will increase from before to after the conference.

2. Attitude and Opinion Change. Attitudes and opinions toward the military services held by the participants will change in a favorable direction from before to after the conference.

3. Behavior Change. The number of speeches by the participants on military subjects will increase from before to after the conference.

4. Gains in information (H1) will be associated with correlative improvements in attitudes and opinions (H2).

5. Improvements in attitudes and opinions (H2) will be associated with correlative favorable behavior change (H3).

6. Gains in information (H1) will be associated with correlative favorable behavior change (H3).

In order to test these hypotheses, it was necessary to obtain a set of data before the conference and a comparable set of data after the conference, and to establish a "control" group.

great substance. While our literature reviewed does not point unequivocally to positive predictions, all of the experiences are claimed to position teams for purposes of training.

1. Identification. The extent of knowledge about the military service possessed by the participants will increase from before to after the experiences.

2. Attitude and Position Change. Attitudes and opinions toward the military services held by the participants will change in a favorable direction from before to after the experiences.

3. Behavior Change. The number of questions by the participants on military subjects will increase from before to after the experiences.

4. Gains in Information (GI) will be associated with correlative improvements in attitudes and opinions (GO).

5. Improvements in attitudes and opinions (GO) will be associated with correlative improvements in behavior change (GB).

6. Gains in information (GI) will be associated with correlative favorable behavior change (GB).

In order to test these hypotheses, it was necessary to obtain a set of data before the seminars, and a comparable set of data after the seminars, and to administer a "control" group.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The invitation list for JCOC 40 was compiled in the Directorate for Community Relations of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) in the Pentagon in March 1970. The list, comprised of 187 names, was made available by OASD(PA) to this researcher March 27.

Design

This study uses a "pretest-posttest control group design."[1] However, the "control" group is non-random and, therefore, is actually a "comparison" group: those persons invited to JCOC, but who declined, compose the comparison group. Thus, self-selection is a primary threat to validity.[2] Another key threat to validity in "before-after" study is "sensitization."[3] In an effort to minimize

---

[1] N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago, 1963), see Chapter V for discussion of quasi-experimental designs, by Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Steven H. Chaffee and Jack M. McLeod, "Sensitization in Panel Design: A Coorientation Experiment," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 661-669.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The investigation into the [illegible] was conducted in the laboratory for [illegible] analysis of the effect of the [illegible] concentration of [illegible] (Fe(II)) on the [illegible] in March 1970. The [illegible], consisting of 187 [illegible], was made available by [illegible] in this [illegible] March 17.

Design

This study uses a "pre-test-post-test control group design."[1] However, the "control" group is non-random and, therefore, is actually a "comparison" group. Since problems limited to 2000, but was declined, engaged the comparison group. Thus, multivariation is a primary threat to validity.[2] Another key threat to validity is "history-effect" study is "[illegible]."[3] In an effort to minimize

---

[1] [illegible]. [illegible] (Chicago, 1963). See Chapter 3 for discussion of quasi-experimental designs, by [illegible] and [illegible] Brealey.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Steven M. Cunitz and John R. [illegible], "Controlling time in pre-[illegible] designs: a [illegible] approach," [illegible], Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 352-[illegible].

sensitization no warning was given, at the time the first questionnaire was mailed, that a follow-up questionnaire would be forthcoming. And the time interval was set at six months to enhance the "resurgence of old attitudes."[4]

Sample

A census survey of the 187 persons invited to attend JCOC was conducted by means of a self-administered questionnaire, mostly involving fixed-alternative items, mailed April 6, 1970 (see Appendix A). Accompanying the questionnaire was a letter encouraging replies and promising anonymity (see Appendix B). A postcard followed the questionnaire in the mail a week later, again encouraging response (see Appendix C). The questionnaire required about 10 minutes to complete. There was no prior notification about the study to the respondents by any Defense Department or military official, to preclude any possibility that the respondents would link the researcher with such agencies.

The before-test response rate was 86 per cent for the participant-group and 63 per cent for the comparison group. Thus, the preliminary N for this study was established at 130: 48 in the JCOC participant group and 82

---

[4]R. Barry Farrell (ed.), Approaches to Comparative and International Politics (Evanston, 1966), p. 25.

antiplasmon on warning was given, as the time the first quasiconsole was called, what a million-to quasiconsole would be destroying. And the time interval was not so big enough to achieve the "asymptotes of old motions."[3]

Simple

A campus survey of the LAT yesterday involved in around 2000 was conducted by means of a self-administered questionnaire, mainly concerning time-alternative times. Called April 4, 1970 (see appendix 1). Nonsequential the quasiconsole was a latter accompanying replies and providing monthly (see appendix 1). A personal followed the quasiconsole in the call a week later, again accompanying response (see appendix 2). The quasiconsole replied about 16 minutes to complete. There was no prior notification time about the study to the respondents by any informal department or military official. To provide any possibility that the respondents would like the questionnaire with such symmetry.

The before-test response rate was 84 per cent for the semiclosed-group and 61 per cent for the nonclosed group. Thus, the probability P for this study was established as 1/24. 0 in the 2000 participants group and 81

---

[3]. Harry Ferrell (ed.), Proceedings in Quasiconsole and Microscopical Fallacies (Pittsburg, 2001), p. 17.

in the comparison group.

JCOC 40

The conference was held April 19-28, 1970. It convened at 1:00 p.m. at the Hotel Del Coronado, Coronado, California, April 19, with Department of Defense and U. S. Pacific Command briefings.

Units of the U. S. First Fleet in the Pacific were visited by the conferees on April 20. Subsequently the itinerary included visits to the First Aerospace Division (Strategic Air Command), Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, April 21; the North American Air Defense Command, Colorado Springs, April 22; U. S. Army III Corps, Fort Hood, Texas, April 23 and 24; the 2d Marine Division, U. S. Marine Corps, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, April 25 and 26; the U. S. Strike Command, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, April 27. The final day of the conference, April 28, was spent in the Pentagon, where the conferees were briefed and held discussions with various Defense Department officials including Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

A second questionnaire was mailed on October 6, 1970, to those persons who responded to the first one (see Appendixes D, E, and F). The response rate on this second wave was 77 per cent for the participant group and 60 per cent for the comparison group. Thus, final Ns were 37 and 49, respectively. Demographic data comparing the two

in the cooperation group.

Mood 40

The mobilization was held April 19-20, 1970. It commenced at 1100 p.m. at the Royal Lad Brotherhood, Sunshadow, California. April 19, with Supervisor of Medicine and S. M. Wolfie Command Principle.

Data at hand of A. Stone plane in the Pacific were visited by the conference on April 20. Subsequently the itinerary included visits to the Tiger Paragon division (Parasuje air command), including its Rover Base. Oscillocorin. April 21: the Sierra Maestro Air Defense Command, Colorado springs. April 22: S. M. Long Sis Group, Mark Good, Texas, April 23 and 24: the 24 Medical Division, S. M. Marine Corps, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. April 25 and 26: visit S. M. Atlas Command, Fogo Air Force Base, North Carolina. April 27. The final day of the conference, April 28, was spent in the Pentagon, where the conference were briefed and held discussions with various Defense Department officials including Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

A second questionnaire was mailed in October 2, 1970 to those persons who responded to the first one (see Appendix 2). Of 25, 20 or 80. The response rate on this mailed wave was 77 per cent for the principal group and 80 per cent for the comparison group. Thus, there is only 27 and 40, respectively. Demographic data comparing the two

groups are shown in Tables I, II, and III. There are no appreciable differences by age (Table I). For occupation (Table II) and education (Table III), there are some interesting patterns. For example, 19 per cent of the JCOC group were lawyers and 14 per cent were proprietors or owners of a business. Corresponding percentages in the non-JCOC group total only about one-fourth as large. This could well be accounted for by the fact that those persons who are "in business for themselves" such as attorneys and proprietors are freer to participate in such a lengthy conference than are employed professionals such as teachers, engineers, and accountants. The data relative to educators tend to support this in that 29 per cent of the non_JCOC group were teachers, professors, or college administrators compared to only 8 per cent of the JCOC group. (These differences could also reflect differential attitudes toward the military, between commercial and academic sub-cultures.)

These occupational constraints probably explain the differences in education shown in Table III. Those with postgraduate training (e.g., lawyers) are more likely to hold flexible-schedule jobs than those with four year degrees or less.

This researcher was unable to obtain reliable data regarding the non-JCOC group as to the position or job title the respondents held. Data of this nature were

groups are always in Phases I, II, and III. Women are an approximate difference by age (Table 4). The occupations (Tables 11) and educations (Tables 12) where are some increasingly positive. The example, 19 per cent of the 2000 group were longest and 14 per cent were proprietors or owners of a business. Correspondingly participants in the 500-2000 group total only about one-fourth as large. This could well be accounted for by the fact that those persons who are "in business for themselves" such as proprietors and proprietors are freer to participate in such a leadership conferences than are employed professionals such as engineers, engineers, and accountants. The time pressure to advancement and to support this is that 37 per cent of the 500-2000 group were managers, professors, or moving administrators compared to only 4 per cent of the 2000 group. Women differences could also reflect differential attitudes toward the military, business, commercial and academic enterprises.

These sociological constituents primarily explain the differences in education since in Table 13. Those with positive training (e.g., Imperial) are more likely to have flexible-managerial jobs than those with more year degrees or less.

This comparison was made to relate military data regarding the non-2000 group as to the possible or to utilize the nonmilitary data. Each of this series was

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS, BY AGE

Age	JCOC	Non-JCOC
30-39	11%	14%
40-49	43	37
50-59	30	35
60 and over	16	14
	100% (N=37)	100% (N=49)

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS, AT 100.

Age	2000	2000-2020
35-39	110	34
40-49	43	37
50-59	34	32
60 and over	19	34
	1000	2000
	(5-15)	(5+15)

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS, BY OCCUPATION

Occupation	JCOC	Non-JCOC
Business proprietor, manager	56%	47%
Lawyer (includes judge)	19	2
Journalist	14	12
Educator (includes teacher, administrator)	8	29
Other: accountant, engineer, clergyman	3	10
	100% (N=37)	100% (N=49)

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF VOX TWO TRUCKS, BY DESIGNATION

Designation	ADOC	Man/hour
Business properties:		
Average	4.8	47.4
Camper (luxurious jeep)	12	8
Evacuation	14	12
Economic limousine transport, modified-forward	5	34
Infantry accompanied, equipment, stretcher	1	10
	Line (n=17)	Line (n=40)

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS, BY EDUCATION

Years Completed	JCOC	Non-JCOC
High school	8%	2%
Some college	16	20
College graduate	30	37
Postgraduate	46	41
	100% (N=37)	100% (N=49)

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF THE TWO GROUPS, AT INDUCTION

Years Completed	ICDC	Non-ICDC
Elementary School	20	24
Some Middle	18	19
College Graduate	30	37
Postgraduate	32	41
	100%	100%
	(n=311)	(n=90)

obtained on the JCOC participants, however, and do indicate that they are leaders in their communities. The average number of organizations in which these men participate is about 9; one of them listed 33. Twenty-one of the 56 were presidents of their business corporations, six were chairmen of the board; 12 carried titles of senior or executive vice-president, general manager, or general secretary-treasurer. Six listed themselves as owners or partners in businesses, and the remaining 11 were divided among such titles as senior member (a physician), national commander (VFW, Disabled Veterans, Military Order of Purple Heart), Casting Director (movies), Headmaster, Principal Scientist, and General Counsel. Who's Who listed 11 per cent of the JCOC group and 34 per cent of the non-JCOC group,[5] indicating that the occupational titles for the latter would be at least as impressive if the information were available here.

Prior to the final preparation of the questionnaire, it was submitted to the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory for critique and revision, and it was pretested on five persons residing in the Madison area who could be considered "community leaders."

---

[5] Who's Who In America (Chicago, 1970), Vol. 36, passim.

obstacles on the other participants. However, one of instructors then stop the journey to make commentaries. The average number of interruptions in which these two participants in about 3; one of them lasted 8h. Descriptions of the 3d main protagonists of ethnic Bantawak nationalities, and were classmates of the leader; it started flights of memory or associative stage-variations, general manager, or general secretary/treasurer. His latest assignment as tourism to participate in business, and the awakening it very divided among each flight as major member is appointed, national commander (TNC, Directed Tatsuoka, military order of Tungia Bunny), chasing Sikwunge Lapulas, mechanics, kinsmen Salvation and General Cassell. Apple Bin lasted 1l per cent of the 3000 group and 3h per cent of the non-3000 group,[1] indicating that the correspondent flights for the latter would be as large as impossible if the information were realistic here.

Flight to the final description of the questionnaire, it was submitted to the Filamonic Hurry Laboratory laboratory for utility and reliable, and it was presented as five persons meeting in the meeting here who could be considered "commonly learner."

---

[1]Ebele Ube Ik Ewelue (Onitsha, 1970), vol. 3d, phase.

Measures

Information gain.--This refers to factual information known by the respondents. In the first wave questionnaire they were asked these five questions requiring factual answers (correct answers are checked):

1. Which one of the Armed Forces do you think has the most troops in Vietnam?

   _X_ Army ___ Navy ___ Air Force ___ Marine Corps

2. About what percentage of the nation's budget is presently being allocated to defense spending?

   ___ 20% _X_ 40% ___ 60% ___ 80%

3. About how many American troops are presently in Vietnam?

   ___ 250,000 _X_ 450,000 ___ 650,000 ___ 850,000

4. Who is the present Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee?

   ___ Carl Albert ___ Wilbur Mills
   ___ Edward Hebert _X_ Mendel Rivers

5. How many general officers have been killed in Vietnam?

   ___ None ___ One ___ Three _X_ Five

In an attempt to avoid direct test "sensitization" effects regarding the specific items asked, a set of five different but analogous questions was prepared for the second questionnaire:

1. Who is the Commander of the American military forces in Vietnam?

   _X_ Gen. Abrams ___ Gen. Walt
   ___ Gen. Goodpaster ___ Gen. Westmoreland

Elementary

Participation Lists.--This lesson is to teach children also known by the neighborhood. If the class were questions ARE: they also ask about their questions regarding local elections (counter examples are checked):

1. Which one of the famed Pueblo do you think has the most trouble in Vietnam?

   X Arms ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

2. Does when population of the nation's Indent is primarily being allowed to enforce equality?

   ___Yes X No ___Yes ___No

3. About how many Muslim people are primarily in Vietnam?

   ___100,000 X 400,000 ___600,000 ___800,000

4. Who is the present chairman of the Hous. Armed Service Committee?

   ___Carl Albert ___William Bates
   ___Edward Boggs X Mendel Rivers

5. How many general officers have been killed in Vietnam?

   ___Zero ___One ___Three X Five

   It is strange to hold civics test "nonpartisan" efforts regarding the specific issue model, a set of two different but analogous questions was presented in the second questionnaire:

1. Who is the Commander of the American military forces in Vietnam?

   X Gen. Westmo ___Gen. Ryan
   ___Gen. Goodpaster ___Gen. Westmoreland

2. What is the approximate dollar figure of the present U. S. Defense Department's budget?

   ___$45 billion ___$60 billion _X_$75 billion

   ___$90 billion

3. Approximately how many U. S. military personnel have been killed in the war in Vietnam?

   ___23,000 ___28,000 ___36,000 _X_43,000

4. Who is the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee?

   ___Henry Jackson ___Richard Russell
   ___Mike Mansfield _X_John Stennis

5. What is the approximate combined total strength of the U. S. Armed Forces?

   ___2.4 million ___2.6 million _X_2.8 million

   ___3 million

General attitudes.--Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, who introduced the semantic differential, described it as a method for measuring the meaning of an object to an individual.[6] They found that the main component of "meaning" was simply evaluation--roughly, general attitude toward the object. Most social researchers consider it an attitude scale.[7] Carter, Ruggels, and Chaffee provide a recent discussion of its utility in opinion measurement.[8]

---

[6]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana, 1957).

[7]Claire Selltiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (Rev. ed.; New York, 1959), p. 380.

[8]Richard F. Carter, W. Lee Ruggels, and Steven H. Chaffee, "The Semantic Differential in Opinion Measurement," Public Opinion Quarterly, 32:666-674 (1969).

2. What is the approximate dollar figure of CDC grants to T. Dalton Department's budget?

___$40 million ___$60 million ___X_$75 million

___$90 million

3. Approximately how many U. S. military personnel have been killed in the war in Vietnam?

___23,000 ___30,000 ___50,000 ___X_61,000

4. Who is the chairman of the Green Berets Special Warfare Committee?

___Henry Jackson ___Edward Kennedy
___John Ranselle ___X_John Stennis

5. What is the approximate national total diversion of the U. S. Armed Forces?

___2.4 million ___1.4 million ___X_3.8 million

___5 million

Personal activities.--Chapman, Ryan, and Tuchmann, who introduced the economic diversion, described it as a method for measuring the amount of an object to be intercepted.[6] They noted that the main components of "measuring" are energy production--roughly, general activity around the object. Inter social transactions consider is an activate media.[7] Series, Rogers, and Clarke provide a recent discussion of its utility in opinion measurement.[8]

---

[6]Charles R. Chapman, Jerome S. Ryan, and Harry W. Tuchmann, The Measurement of Mission Impact (1971).

[7]Clarke Bailey, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New. edg. New York, 1970), p. 120.

[8]Richard F. Series, J. Lee Rogers, and Edwin R. Clarke, "The Semantic Differential in Opinion Measurement," Public Opinion Quarterly, 37(Sep-Oct 1973).

It has proven particularly useful in probing latent and subtle attitude shifts, and therefore was considered ideal for assessing the effects of JCOC. An eight-item battery of differential scales was prepared, comprised of commonly used descriptive words pertaining to the internal evaluations of the military services. Four of these were "favorable" adjectives, and four "unfavorable"; in alphabetical order:

Please rate on a one-to-seven scale the following words on how well they describe the U. S. Armed Forces, in your opinion:

1. Dedicated:	Very dedicated					Not at all dedicated	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Disciplined:	Very disciplined				Not at all well disciplined		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Disorganized:	Very disorganized					Not at all disorganized	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Efficient:	Very efficient					Not at all efficient	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Incompetent:	Very incompetent					Not at all incompetent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Irresolute:	Very irresolute					Not at all irresolute	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Modern:	Very modern					Not at all modern	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Unprofessional:	Very unprofessional				Not at all unprofessional		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

In some personnel psychology, useful in predicting future and subtle assessing ability, and therefore was considered final for measuring the citizens of 2000. An eight-item battery of differential scales was produced, comprising of respondents made descriptive words pertaining to the national evaluations of the military services. Four of these were "favourably" adjectives, and four "unfavourably" in eight-point bipolar scales.

Please rate on a one-to-seven scale the following words as how well they describe the U. S. Armed Forces. In your opinion:

1. Dedicated	Very dedicated 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all dedicated 7
2. Disciplined	Very disciplined 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all disciplined 7
3. Idealistic	Very idealistic 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all idealistic 7
4. Efficient	Very efficient 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all efficient 7
5. Incompetent	Very incompetent 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all incompetent 7
6. Irresponsible	Very irresponsible 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all irresponsible 7
7. Modern	Very modern 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all modern 7
8. Unsophisticated	Very unsophisticated 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all unsophisticated 7

On the second wave, each of the items was replaced by an antonym:

Please rate on a one-to-seven scale the following words on how well they describe the U. S. Armed Forces, in your opinion:

1. Competent:	Very competent						Not at all competent
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Indifferent:	Very indifferent						Not at all indifferent
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Inefficient:	Very inefficient						Not at all inefficient
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Old-fashioned:	Very old-fashioned				Not at all old-fashioned		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Organized:	Very well organized				Not at all well organized		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Professional:	Very professional					Not at all professional	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Resolute:	Very resolute						Not at all resolute
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Undisciplined:	Very undisciplined				Not at all undisciplined		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The general attitude score on each wave consists of sum of scores, in a favorable direction, across the eight items.

Opinion.--Hovland, Janis, and Kelley defined opinion as ". . . answers that an individual gives in

On the second week, each of the items was followed by an antonym:

Please, circle one of a six-point scale the following words on how well they describe you in Spanish course. Is your opinion:

1. Comfortable:	Very comfortable 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all comfortable
2. Confident:	Very confident 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all confident
3. Confident:	Very confident 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all confident
4. Pressured:	Very pressured 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all pressured
5. Concerned:	Very well concerned 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all well concerned
6. Irritated:	Very irritated 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all irritated
7. Leading:	Very leading 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all leading
8. Motivated:	Very motivated 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not at all motivated

The general attitude scores on each were averaged to form a score. In a Gaussian distribution, scores fall right [illegible].

Origins.—Personal, family, and during distance

Spanish as "[illegible] Spanish play an instrumental role in

response to stimulus situations in which some general question is raised."[9] In view of the various and conflicting definitions of "attitude" and "opinion" (Insko, for example, discusses four different definitions),[10] it was considered best to keep the two concepts separate in this study, and attempt to measure change in both. Ten items designed to measure opinion change between the two waves were included in both questionnaires. The items on the first wave were:

1. What is your personal attitude toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

___Very favorable	___Moderately favorable	___No opinion
___Moderately unfavorable	___Very unfavorable	

Numerous statements have been made recently about the U. S. military by members of the mass media, Congressional leaders, and others. Please indicate your opinion on the following:

2. The military budget should be drastically reduced.

___Strongly agree	___Moderately agree	___No opinion
___Moderately disagree	___Strongly disagree	

---

[9]Carl I. Hovland, Irving Janis, and Harold Kelley, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven, 1953), p. 6.

[10]Chester A. Insko (ed.), Theories of Attitude Change (New York, 1967), pp. 2-3; and Charles A. Kiesler, et al., Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches (New York, 1969), pp. 1-5.

response to minority situations in which more informed position is taken.[9] In view of the various and contradictory definitions of "minority" and "majority" groups, for example, discussions from different individuals,[10] it was considered best to keep the one concrete reference in this study, and attempt to measure opinion between the two groups where included in both dimensions. The items on the first page were:

1. What is your personal attitude toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

___ very favorable	___ indifferent favorable	___ unfavorable opinion
___ unfavorable unfavorable	___ very	

Previous studies have been made concerning about the U. S. military by members of the press media, congressional leaders, and others. Please indicate your opinion on the following:

2. The military today should be strengthened considerably.

___ strongly agree	___ moderately agree	___ no opinion
___ moderately disagree	___ strongly disagree	

---

[9]Carl I. Hovland, Irving Janis, and Harold Kelley, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven, 1953), p. 8.

[10]Cameron A. Hume (ed.), Theories of Attitude Change (New York, 1967), pp. 2-3; and Charles A. Kiesler, et al., Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches (New York, 1969), pp. 1-8.

3. Further development and deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) is essential to the national security.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

4. The military is distorting the truth by denying the presence of American combat forces in Laos.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

5. America's foremost position as a world leader is dependent upon the maintenance of vigorous and viable Armed Forces.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

6. The American military man in Vietnam is unsurpassed in fighting skill, determination, and courage under fire.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

7. The American military services have a vested interest in continuing the Vietnam War.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

8. Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces leads to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?

___More ___Less ___Has no effect

3. Rather correspondence and conferences of the Guilbaldin Medicine (GMM) is essential to the national security.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

4. The military is directing the trends by keeping the presence of American medical personnel in Iraq.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

5. Russia's foreign policies as a world leader is dependent upon the relationship of Japanese and viable food forces.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

6. The American military and in Vietnam is unnecessary in highly skill, aeronautics, and nations defer air-

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

7. The American military services have a varied interest in combating the Vietnam War.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

8. Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces leads to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?

___More ___Less ___Has no effect

Listed below in alphabetical order are eight occupations. How much status do you accord to these occupations? Please indicate the one to which you accord the most status by marking the number "1" by it; mark a "2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Rank each of the occupations, so that you will mark an "8" by the one you regard the least.

___Bookkeeper	___Minister/priest
___Farmer	___Physician
9. ___Military enlisted man	___Public school teacher
10. ___Military officer	___Radio/TV announcer

For items (9) and (10), the rankings of the eight occupations were scored on an 8-7-6 etc. basis, from first-ranked on down. Only the scores for "military enlisted man" and "military officer" enter into the data analysis.

On the second wave two modifications were made. The item referring to Laos (No. 4) was deleted because it was no longer relevant, the presence of U. S. forces in Laos having been publicly established as fact by that time. Substituted in its place was an item referring to Cambodia, a more current issue. The wording of the item was made as similar to the replaced item as possible.

A second modification was made on the item that requested a ranking of occupations (Nos. 9-10). So that none of the respondents would be asked to rank his own occupation in both waves of the questionnaire, the non-military occupations from the first wave were replaced by

Please review the choosing-sided order for right handpoor-
sions. The most active up that account to finish
handpoldment. Please indicate the one to which you
account the same service by marking the number "1" in the
mark 1 "2" by the one you regard second best, and so
on. Some lack of one descriptions, so that you will
mark as "0" by the one you regard the least.

___Northeastern ___Midwestern/Prairie

___Pacific ___Appalachian

9. ___Military-minded man ___Public school teacher

10. ___Military nation ___Society's economic

The items (9) and (10), the children of the right handpoor-
sions were scored on an F-T-S mix, taken, from Tiedt-Tiedt
as done. Only the scores for "military-minded man" and
"military nation" entered into the data analysis.

In the second were two qualifications were made.
The item concerning to turn Yak, if was defined Indians in
was ye longer relevant, the pressure at T. e. except in
been having been publicly articulated as item by east time.
Substituted in its place was an item referring to Canadian
a more distant issue. The wording of the item was made as
similar to the original item as possible.

A second qualification was made on the item that
compared a training of descendants (Qne. 9-10). In item
form of the respondents would be asked to rank the two
occupations in both areas of the questionnaire, the mer-
military occupations from the first were later replaced by

occupations having a similar prestige ranking.[11] An exception had to be made for "minister/priest," because no comparable substitute occupation could be found; this occupation applies to only three respondents in the study.

The following was substituted for item 4 above:

4a. The military is distorting the truth by claiming that American air support for Cambodian military operations is mainly to reduce American casualties in Vietnam.

The following was substituted for the occupational ranking items:

Listed below in alphabetical order are eight occupations. How much status do you accord to these occupations? Please indicate the one to which you accord the most status by marking the number "1" by it; mark a "2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Please rank <u>each</u> of the occupations, so that you will mark an "8" by the one you regard the least:

___Farm owner	___Minister/priest
___Insurance agent	___Newspaper reporter
9. ___Military enlisted man	___Scientist
10. ___Military officer	___Social worker

<u>Behavior</u>.--This refers to "overt" behavior, relevant to the military and the public. Respondents were asked to report the number of public speeches given during the preceding six-month period, and of that total how many

---

[11] National Opinion Research Center, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.), <u>Class, Status and Power</u> (Glencoe, Illinois, 1953), pp. 411-426.

correspondence having a similar growing tendency.[13] In another item had to be made for "military/prison." Increase in correspondence administrative correspondence would be found; this correspondence applies to only those transactions in the study.

The following was substituted for item 4 above:

4a. The military in distributing the burden by minimizing that insofar air support for Cambodian military operations is mainly to reduce American casualties in Vietnam.

The following was substituted for the sociopsychological coding items:

Listed below in alphabetical order are eight correspondences. How much attention do you accord to these correspondents? Please indicate the one to which you accord the most attention by writing the number "1" by it; then a "2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Please rank eight of the correspondents, so that you will rank as "8" by the one you regard the lowest:

___Your family ___Civilian/prison

___Town/main square ___Sociopsychs support

9. ___Military assigned man ___Journalist

10. ___Military officer ___Social worker

Background.—This refers to "social" behavior relevant to the military and the public. Respondents were asked to report the number of public appearances given during the preceding eleven-month period, and to rate their level and many

---

[13]Empirical opinion research terms, "data and Correspondence: A Popular Evaluation," in Malcolm Smith and Raymond R. Lizant (eds.), Times, Places and Times (Dinuvoo, Illinois, 1971), pp. 411-419.

speeches were devoted to a military subject. This measure is necessarily based on self-report, since it was impossible for the researcher to observe overt behavior.[12]

Specific items were:

1. About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months? _____
2. How many of them were on a military subject? _____

The key measure of behavior was the item concerning speeches on a military subject. In testing Hypothesis 3, the ratio of military speeches to total speeches (before and after the conference) was compared between the two respondent groups. In testing Hypotheses 5 and 6, the number of military speeches to total speeches was converted to a percentage figure and utilized as a gain item in computing inter-item correlations.

Restatement of Hypotheses

Rephrased in operational terms, this study will test the following hypotheses, assuming that the first wave data will show no significant difference between the two groups:

1. The JCOC group will score higher on the five-item knowledge test than will the comparison group.
2. a. The JCOC group will express more favorable attitudes toward the military on the semantic

---

[12]Kiesler, et al., op. cit., p. 17.

questions were directed to a military population. This research is primarily based on satisfactory answers to the questionnaire which the respondents to discern overall behavior.[17]

Specific items were:

1. About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months? _____

2. How many of them were on a military subject? _____

The key measure of behavior was the item concerning speeches on a military subject. In testing hypothesis 3, the ratio of military speeches to total speeches (before and after the curriculum) was compared between the two comparison groups. In testing hypothesis 1 and 2, the number of military speeches to total speeches was converted to a percentage figure and utilized as a point item in computing Mann-Whitney correlations.

Limitations of Instrument

Inherent in questional design, this study will test the following hypotheses assuming that the first two data will show no significant difference between the two groups:

1. The ROTC group will score higher on the Stevenson knowledge test than will the comparison group.

2. The ROTC group will express more favorable attitudes toward the military on the semantic

---

[17]Alcofer, et al., op. cit., p. 17.

differential scales than will the comparison group.

b. The JCOC group will express more favorable opinions regarding the military than will the comparison group.

3. a. The JCOC group will give more speeches on military subjects than will the comparison group.

b. A higher proportion of speeches given by the JCOC group will involve military subjects than those of the comparison group.

4. a. There will be a greater correlation between information gain and attitude change scores in the JCOC group than in the comparison group.

b. There will be a greater correlation between information gain and opinion change scores in the JCOC group than in the comparison group.

5. a. There will be a greater correlation between attitude change and behavior change scores in the JCOC group than in the comparison group.

b. There will be a greater correlation between opinion change and behavior change scores in the JCOC group than in the comparison group.

6. There will be a greater correlation between information gain and behavior change scores in the JCOC group than in the comparison group.

differential ratings than will the cooperation group.

b. The CCBC group will express more favorable opinions concerning the military ship than will the cooperation group.

2. a. The CCBC group will give more spontaneous or military answers than will the cooperation group.

b. A higher percentage of responses given by the CCBC group will involve military subjects than those of the cooperation group.

4. a. There will be a positive correlation between interpersonal gain and individual change scores in the CCBC group than in the cooperation group.

b. There will be a positive correlation between interpersonal gain and opinion change scores in the CCBC group than in the cooperation group.

3. a. There will be a negative correlation between attitude change and behavior change scores in the CCBC group than in the cooperation group.

b. There will be a greater correlation between opinion change and behavior change scores in the CCBC group than in the cooperation group.

c. There will be a greater correlation between interpersonal gain and behavior change scores in the CCBC group than in the cooperation group.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Information Gain

The before-after data in Table IV indicate that the JCOC group consistently gained on each of the five items in comparison with the non-JCOC group. The mean difference between the two groups was .01 in favor of the non-JCOC group on the first wave, and .31 in favor of JCOC on the second wave. This difference, although not quite statistically significant, is consistent with the first hypothesis; the JCOC program seems to have succeeded in stimulating a greater knowledge of military matters among the participants to a modest degree. The failure to reach conventional significance levels can be at least partly explained by the small Ns. The fact that the after-score differences are consistent across several items lends credence to the information-gain hypothesis. Discounting the one tie, the pattern of 4-of-4 items in the predicted direction would occur only six times in 100 by chance.

General Attitudes

Analysis of the eight semantic differential items in Table V also shows a positive effect of JCOC. On each

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Laboratory data

The laboratory data in Table IV indicate that the 3000 group consistently yielded an index of the five lines in comparison with the 300/3000 group. The index difference between the two groups was -.01 at least of the 300/3000 group on the first wave, and -.21 in favor of 3000 on the second wave. This difference, although not quite significantly significant, is consistent with the first hypothesis: the 3000 program seems to have succeeded in eliminating a greater tendency of military subjects among the participants to a modest degree. The failure to reach conventional significance levels can be at least partly explained by the small Ns. The fact that the interaction difference was consistent across several time lines lends confidence to the interpretation-plus hypothesis. Examining the raw file, the pattern of error-5 items in the prediction situation seems to occur only six times in 100 by chance.

Subject Reactions

Analysis of the single semantic differential items in Table 4 also shows a positive trend of 3000. In each

TABLE IV

KNOWLEDGE OF MILITARY MATTERS

	Proportion Answering Correctly Before and After JCOC			
	JCOC Participants		Comparison Group	
	Before	After	Before	After
First Questionnaire				
Which of Armed Forces has most troops in Vietnam?	.97		1.00	
What percentage of nation's budget is allocated to defense spending?	.57		.60	
How many American troops are in Vietnam?	.90		.80	
Who is Chairman of House Armed Services Committee?	.92		.88	
How many general officers have been killed in Vietnam?	.30		.39	
Second Questionnaire				
Who is Commander of American military forces in Vietnam?		.95		.88
What is approximate dollar figure of Defense Department?		.54		.45
How many U. S. military personnel have been killed in Vietnam?		.59		.59

TABLE 24

RESPONSES OF MILITARY WIVES

	Proportion Answering Correctly Before and After 1980			
	AUSC Participants		Comparison Group	
	Before	After	Before	After
Fact Questions				
Which of Armed Forces has most troops in Vietnam?	.27		.19	
What percentage of nation's budget is allocated to defense spending?	.27		.22	
How many American troops are in Vietnam?	.30		.21	
Who is Chairman of Senate Armed Services Committee?	.25		.22	
How many general officers have been killed in Vietnam?	.30		.13	
Recall Questions				
Who is Commander of American military forces in Vietnam?	.43		.07	
What is approximate dollar figure of Defense Department?	.14		.05	
How many U. S. military personnel have been killed in Vietnam?	.15		.20	

TABLE IV (Continued)

	Proportion Answering Correctly Before and After JCOC			
	JCOC Participants		Comparison Group	
	Before	After	Before	After
Who is Chairman of Senate Armed Services Committee?		.54		.45
What is total strength of U. S. Armed Forces?		.24		.18
Total Score	3.66	2.86	3.67	2.55

Difference Before: 3.66 - 3.67 = -.01 (for control)

After: 2.86 - 2.55 = +.31[a] (for JCOC)

Net: +.32 (for JCOC)[b]

[a] $z = 1.14$, $p = .13$

[b] $z = 1.25$, $p = .11$

TABLE IV (Concluded)

	Production Manager Controls Sales and Also Some Some			
	Some Other Area		Somewhat Other Area	
	Before Time	Before Time	Before Time	Before Time
Who is Chairman of Sales Board (Service Committee)	.04		.12	
Who is head Managers of U. S. Trade Tourney)	.24		.12	
Total Score	3.86	3.88	3.87	3.95
Difference between 3.86 - 3.87 = -.01 (Low Weekend)				
Effect 3.88 - 3.95 = -.07 (Low Week)				
Total -.01 (Low Week)				

^{a} = 1.16, p = .12

^{b} = 1.25, p = .12

TABLE V

GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD THE MILITARY

		One-to-Seven Favorability Scale[a] Before and After JCOC						
		JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			
First Questionnaire	Second Questionnaire	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net JCOC
Dedicated	Indifferent	5.57	5.69	+.12	5.33	5.23	-.10	+.22
Disciplined	Undisciplined	5.65	5.58	-.07	5.22	5.06	-.16	+.09
Disorganized	Organized	5.37	5.70	+.33	4.96	5.23	+.27	+.06
Efficient	Inefficient	5.16	5.47	+.31	4.67	4.50	-.17	+.48
Incompetent	Competent	5.69	5.89	+.20	5.29	5.40	+.11	+.09
Irresolute	Resolute	5.15	5.97	+.82	4.98	5.30	+.32	+.50
Modern	Old-fashioned	5.92	5.47	-.45	5.31	4.77	-.54	+.09
Unprofessional	Professional	5.25	6.00	+.75	5.02	5.44	+.42	+.33
		43.76	45.77	+2.01[b]	40.78	40.93	+.15[b]	+1.86

[a]Seven represents maximum favorability.

[b]$z = 1.47$, $p = .07$

TABLE V

GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD THE MILITARY

Item Description	Random Questionnaire	One-to-Seven Favorability Basis[a] Before and After Job						
		Job Participants				Control Group		
		Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net Joint
Dedicated	Idealistic	3.07	3.09	+.12	3.23	3.23	-.10	+.21
Disciplined	Unthoughtful	3.05	3.06	-.07	3.23	3.08	-.15	+.09
Disciplined	Undisciplined	3.27	3.20	+.39	3.34	3.23	+.23	+.07
Efficient	Inefficient	3.14	3.17	+.03	3.07	3.30	-.13	+.06
Intelligent	Unintelligent	3.04	3.39	+.30	3.29	3.40	+.11	+.04
Irresponsible	Responsible	3.13	3.27	+.03	3.08	3.10	+.22	+.20
Modern	Old-Fashioned	3.24	3.47	-.04	3.31	3.17	-.14	+.00
Unprofessional	Professional	3.05	3.00	+.18	3.02	3.44	+.02	+.16
		21.16	18.17	+2.03[b]	20.18	20.33	+.12[b]	+1.00

[a] Across respondents maximum favorability.

[b] $t_a = 1.67$, $p = .07$

of the eight items, the JCOC group consistently gained (or diminished less), when compared to the non-JCOC group. This finding is significant at the $p = .004$ level, by sign test. The mean difference between the two groups changed in a favorable direction by an average of .23 per item for JCOC. Hypothesis 2a was that participation in the conference would result in the enhancement of the general attitudes toward the military. While one is never quite certain what a single semantic differential measures, this consistency across a battery of scales certainly seems to support the hypothesis. The results are not as clear-cut as would be the case in a true experimental design, because the two groups were not equal at the beginning of the study. In at least one respect, however, this "before" difference worked <u>against</u> the hypothesis, because it created a "ceiling" in that the JCOC group had less room for improvement in their attitudes toward the military. Still, one could argue that the JCOC group was "predisposed" to become more favorable, as indicated by their initially more favorable attitudes.[1]

<u>Opinion Change</u>

Analysis of the ten specific opinion items indicates an even split between the two groups: the JCOC group

---

[1]Klapper, "The Social Effects of Mass Communication," <u>op. cit.</u>

at the height times, the GSDC group dramatically yielded its dissidition level, when compared to the Inter-GSDC group. This finding is significant at the .0[illegible] level, by sign test. The mean difference between the two groups changed in a favorable direction by an average of .22 per item for GSDC. Apparently it was their participation in the decision-making which led to the enhancement of ego growth.

Analysis showed the military, daily and in every sense central mode a single massive environmental measure, this consistently across a variety of points revealing means to support the hypothesis. The problem was not so clear-cut as would be the case in a true experimental design because the two groups were not equal at the beginning of the study. It is in fact one research. However, this "taken" difference worked against the hypothesis. Instead it created a "ceiling" in that the GSDC group had less room for improvement in their attitudes toward the military. Still, one could argue that the GSDC group was "prepsychosed" to begin more innovative, as indicated by their initially more favorable attitudes.[1]

Opinion Change

Analysis of the two specific opinion items (Iran-Korea) to view shift between the groups showed the GSDC group

---

[1]Kingsmen, "The Social Effects of Some Conservation," op. cit.

gained in favorability on five of the items and the non-JCOC group gained in favorability on five of the items. An index constructed from these ten items showed a slight differential gain in favor of the JCOC group, but this does not approach statistical significance ($z = .79$). Thus, Hypothesis 2b should be rejected. The results are analyzed separately by items in Tables VI, VII, and VIII, which show, respectively, three items on which there is a positive (pro-JCOC) gain, four items on which there is no appreciable difference between the two groups, and three items that seem to show negative (anti-JCOC) effects.

The three positive effects items (Table VI) have to do with current issues regarding public perceptions of military capabilities and policies. The JCOC group increases, and the non-JCOC group decreases, in their disagreement with this statement:

"The American military services have a vested interest in continuing the Vietnam War."

And, their agreement with this statement:

"The American military man in Vietnam is unsurpassed in fighting skill, determination, and courage under fire."

Both groups gain, but the JCOC group more so, in agreeing that:

"Further development and deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) is essential to the national

period in favorability on five of the items and the Jcsc-Jcsc group yielded in favorability on five of the items. In these comparisons the other two items showed a higher differential gain in favor of the Jcsc group, but this does not approach statistical significance (z = .70). Thus, hypotheses 3b should be rejected. The results are analyzed separately by items in Tables VI, VII, and VIII. Which show, respectively, these items on which there is a positive (pre-Jcsc) gain, more items on which there is no appreciable difference between the two groups, and items that show to have negative (post-Jcsc) attitude.

The three positive effects item (Tables VI) have to do with answer issues regarding public perceptions of military capabilities and policies. The Jcsc group increases, and the non-Jcsc group decreases, in their disagreement with this statement:

"The American military services have a vested interest in something the Viet-Nam War."

And, their agreement with this statement:

"The American military has no plans in Vietnam in anticipation of fighting well, differentiation, but observe under time."

Each groups gain, but the Jcsc group more so, in agreeing that:

"Further development and deployment of the intercontinental missile (ICBM) is essential to the national

TABLE VI

OPINIONS TOWARD THE MILITARY: POSITIVE EFFECTS

	One-to-Five Agreement-with-Statement Scale,[a] Before and After JCOC						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			
Statement	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net JCOC
American military services have vested interest in continuing Vietnam War. (negative item)	3.67	4.38	+.71	3.98	3.88	-.10	+.81
American military man in Vietnam is unsurpassed in fighting skill, determination, and courage under fire.	1.81	1.59	+.22	2.02	2.34	-.32	+.54
Further development and deployment of ABM is essential to national security.	1.95	1.51	+.44	2.57	2.35	+.22	+.22

[a]A score of 1 represents maximum agreement with statement.

security."

No differential gain or loss (Table VII) occurs on general attitudes toward military personnel, the Armed Forces, or the credibility of military information reports.

The negative effects (Table VIII) should not be interpreted as "boomerangs," since they consist of items on which the JCOC group did not change, but the non-JCOC group did change--surprisingly, in a favorable direction toward the military. These three items appear to involve fairly global feelings about the role of the military in American society:

"The military budget should be drastically reduced."

"America's foremost position as a world leader is dependent upon the maintenance of vigorous and viable Armed Forces."

"Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces leads to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?"

Looking at Hypothesis 2 as a unit, then, while the semantic differential data indicate positive attitude change as a result of participation in JCOC, this shift in general affect does not seem to have manifested itself in specific verbal opinions as well. It is perhaps noteworthy that the pro-JCOC (Table VI) items, as well as the semantic differential items, represent evaluations of the military

society."

An editorial page of June (Folio VIII) focuses on general attitudes toward military personnel, the taxes thereon, or the credibility of military information reports.

The negative efforts (Folio VIII) should not be interpreted as "pacifismo," since they consist of issues on which the ADOC group did not change, but the non-ADOC group did change--surprisingly, in a favorable direction toward the military. These issues tend appear to involve basic global feelings about the role of the military in American society.

"The military budget should be distributed proposal."

"America's dominant position as a world leader is dependent upon its maintenance of vigorous and vigorous armed forces."

"In you last that serving in one of its armed forces tends to meet or to have social responsibility in their civilian life?"

Leading as opposition 1 or 2 only, then, while the remaining differential this indicate positive attitude change as a result of participation in ADOC, this shift in general effect does not seem to have emphasized itself in specific verbal opinions as well. It is perhaps noteworthy that the pre-ADOC Folio VII items, as well as the remaining differential items, regarding mobilization of the military

TABLE VII

OPINIONS TOWARD THE MILITARY: NO DIFFERENTIAL GAIN

	One-to-Five Agreement-with-Statement Scale,[a] Before and After JCOC						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			
Statement	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net JCOC
Military is distorting truth by denying presence of American combat forces in Laos. (negative item)	3.24			3.13			
Military is distorting truth by claiming American air support for Cambodian military operations is to reduce American casualties in Vietnam. (negative item)		3.97	+.73		3.80	+.67	+.06

[a]One represents maximum agreement with statement.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item	One-to-Five Favorability Scale,[a] Before and After JCOC						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			
	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net JCOC
Personal attitude toward Armed Forces.	1.27	1.14	+.13	1.47	1.33	+.14	-.01

[a]One represents maximum favorability.

Occupation	One-to-Eight Occupational Prestige Scale,[a] Before and After JCOC						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			
	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net JCOC
Military enlisted man	5.49	5.32	+.17	6.02	5.87	+.15	+.02
Military officer	2.97	2.85	+.12	3.33	3.15	+.18	-.06

[a]One represents maximum-prestige-occupation.

TABLE VIII

OPINIONS TOWARD THE MILITARY: NEGATIVE EFFECTS

	One-to-Five Agreement-with-Statement Scale,[a] Before and After JCOC						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			
Statement	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net JCOC
Military budget should be drastically reduced. (negative item)	4.14	4.27	+.13	2.90	3.53	+.63	-.50
America's foremost position as a world leader is dependent upon maintenance of vigorous and viable Armed Forces.	1.27	1.30	-.03	1.82	1.49	+.33	-.36

[a]One represents maximum agreement with statement.

TABLE VIII

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE MILITARY: MEANING DIFFERENCES

	"Six-Item Agreement-with-Disagreement Scale,"* Before and After 2000						
	2000 Participants			Comparison Group			
Statement	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	Net 2000
Military budget should be drastically reduced. (negative item)	4.34	4.27	+.13	3.80	3.83	+.03	-.10
Americans's economic position as a world leader is dependent upon maintaining of vigorous and viable armed forces.	3.37	3.30	-.03	3.80	3.83	-.03	-.06

*The responses combine agreement with statements.

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Item	Effect of Military Service on Social Responsibility[a]						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			Net JCOC
	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	
Serving in Armed Forces leads to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?	1.32	1.33	-.01	1.42	1.19	+.23	-.24

[a]One represents "more" social responsibility.

internally. None of these items is concerned with the external value of the military to society in general. On the other hand, the items that do not seem to have been changed by JCOC are ones that seek to get at external evaluations.

On the two items having a direct relation to the Vietnam War, JCOC registered its largest gains. This would seem to indicate that this topic was stressed in some way during the JCOC trip, perhaps simply because it was a major question in the minds of the participants. Similarly, since the ABM was a matter of public controversy during the period of JCOC, information obtained by the participants during the conference probably does account for the favorable change regarding this weapon system.

The negative effect item that should concern JCOC planners the most is the question regarding military budget reduction. The JCOC group was originally more inclined to disagree that the military budget should be drastically reduced than the control group, by a difference of 1.24. Yet, on the second wave, the JCOC group was only inclined to disagree with the statement by a difference of .74.

It is conceivable that members of the JCOC observed some aspect of the military that they deemed wasteful or non-productive, perhaps the JCOC program itself. It is also possible that the JCOC became so impressed with the military power of the Armed Forces that it considered no

innocuously. Some of these items is concerned with the universal value of the military to society in general. On the other hand, the items that do not seem to have been changed by JCOC are those that seek to get at universal attributes.

On the two items having a direct relation to the Vietnam War, JCOC replaced the larger point. This would seem to indicate that this topic was changed in some way during the JCOC trip, perhaps simply because it was a major question in the minds of the participants. Similarly, there the MAC was a matter of public concern during the period of JCOC, information obtained by the participants during the conference probably done somewhat for the favorable image regarding this weapon system.

The majority effect line data should convince JCOC planners the most is the question concerning military budget reduction. The JCOC group was significantly more inclined to disagree that the military budget should be drastically reduced than the control group, by a difference of 1.34. Yet, on the general view, the JCOC group was only inclined to disagree with the statement by a difference of .74.

It is conceivable that members of the JCOC decision area lacking of the military that they deemed unrealistic or non-productive, perhaps the JCOC program itself. It is also possible that the JCOC leaders so impressed with the military point of the issue focus that it contributed to

adversary or potential adversary could match that power in the immediate future, so moneys should be devoted to other segments of the nation's economy that are more critically deficient.

The item regarding "America's foremost position" depending on "vigorous and viable Armed Forces" could be construed to support either of the above arguments. If the JCOC observed waste, they might be inclined to downgrade the role of the military relative to world leadership. However, if they were overwhelmed with the nation's military might, they might feel that enough attention had been devoted to that aspect of national power and it was time to attend to other less proficient sectors.

The item regarding social responsibility, while not a "boomerang" in the strict sense, should also be considered seriously in evaluating JCOC. This item refers directly to evaluations of the quality of military personnel (as did the prestige ratings shown in Table VII). At best, it can be concluded that JCOC had no influence on these evaluations.

Inter-item correlations were calculated for the six opinion items that showed differential gains for either group (i.e., the items in Tables VI and VIII). Using an r-to-z transformation to compute mean correlations,[2] the

---

[2]Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics (3d ed.,

adversary or potential adversary could match that power in the immediate future, so manpower should be devoted to other components of the nation's economy that are under critically deficient.

The idea regarding "America's foreign position" depending on "rigorous and viable armed forces" would be construed to support claims at the above responses. If the ROOC observed weeks, they might be inclined to downplay the role of the military relative to world leadership. However, if they were overwhelmed with the nation's military might, they might feel that always strategic had been devoted to this support of national power and it was time to attend to other lame positions issues.

The item regarding social responsibility, while not a "commonly" in the strict sense, should also be considered centrally in evaluating ROOC. This item relates directly to estimations of the quality of military personnel (as did the prestige ratings shown in Table VIII). In fact, it can be concluded that ROOC had no influence on these evaluations.

Inter-item correlations were calculated for the six opinions from that seemed differential gains the sixth group (N=.). The items in Table VI and VIII. Using an r-to-z transformation to compute sign correlations,[2] the

---

[2]John Hammer. Psychological Statistics (N= ed..

following averages were found:

JCOC		Non-JCOC	
Before	After	Before	After
.18	.27	.41	.33

Both before and after, there is a greater tendency among the non-JCOC group to "stereotype" their opinion responses, on the basis of some more general latent attitude toward the military. This may help to account for the fact that the JCOC participants seem to have been rather selective in their patterns of opinion change.

Looking at the data another way, it could be concluded that there were really no "negative" effects, because the failure of the JCOC group to change in a favorable direction could be due to a "ceiling effect." Their initial opinions were to the favorable side of "center" on the whole, whereas the non-JCOC group had more neutral initial opinions and thus more opportunity to change favorably. A ceiling-effect explanation cannot be tested, but it remains as at least a plausible way of accounting for the overall failure to support Hypothesis 2b with more than very minimal indications of opinion change due to the JCOC experience.

New York, 1962), p. 426.

following percentages were found:

DDDC		SCHOOLCRAFT	
Before	After	Before	After
.19	.27	.41	.13

Both before and after, there is a greater tendency among the non-DDDC group to "scapegoating" which implies emphasis on the basis of some more general issues matching leaved the military. This may help to account for the fact that the DDDC participants seem to have been rather selective in their patterns of opinion change.

Looking at the data another way, it could be postulated that there were really no "negative" effects. Because the failure of the DDDC group to change is a fewer role direction could be due to a "waiting attitude." Their initial opinions were in the favorable side of "neutral" on the whole whereas the non-DDDC group had more pronounced initial opinions and thus more opportunity to change favorably. A waiting-after application course is needed, but it remains as at least a plausible way of accounting for the overall failure to support hypothesis 2b with more than very minimal indications of opinion change due to the DDDC experiences.

New York, 1951, p. 436.

Behavior

Two items were designed to measure overt behavior change between the two groups:

1. "About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months?"

2. "How many of them on a military subject?"

The importance of these two items can best be illustrated by presenting them as a ratio. Both the number of military speeches and the ratio of military to total speeches given fell for each group from the first to second wave (Table IX). The military speech percentage of total public speeches dropped from 31 per cent to 27 per cent for JCOC and from 11 per cent to less than 5 per cent for the control group. (It should be pointed out that the JCOC group, by participating in the JCOC, could be expected to make fewer total speeches since they were traveling away from their hometowns more than usual.)

These behavior measures are not very satisfactory, because the initial difference between the two groups (2.97 for JCOC, .96 for non-JCOC) is too great to permit any meaningful comparison of changes. The measure, therefore, is not adequate to determine whether or not Hypothesis 3 is supported. This ratio score is retained below in correlational analysis, however.

Regression

Two lines were designed to measure power relative change between the two groups:

1. "About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months?"

2. "How many of them on a military subject?"

The hypothesis of these two lines was that be illustrated by presenting them in a ratio. Both the number of military speeches and the ratio of military to total speeches given fell for each group from the first to second wave (table 22). The military speech percentage of total public speeches dropped from 31 per cent to 23 per cent for 6000 and from 11 per cent to less than 3 per cent for the control group. (It should be pointed out that the 6000 group, by participating in the 6000, would be expected to make fewer total speeches since they were training every four-hour workshop more than weekly.)

These behavior measures are not very satisfactory, because the initial difference between the two groups (2.97 for 6000, .89 for non-6000) is too great for meaningful comparison of change. The measure, however, does, in our attempts to determine whether or not hypothesis 3 is supported. This ratio score is retained below in correlational analysis, however.

TABLE IX

SPEECH MAKING

Item	Number of Speeches Given						
	JCOC Participants			Comparison Group			Net JCOC
	Before	After	Net	Before	After	Net	
Number of public speeches made in last six months	9.70	8.91	-.79	8.36	10.20	+1.84	-2.63
Number of public speeches on military subject in last six months	2.97	2.41	-.56	.96	.47	-.49	-.07

Factor	Total sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square	F	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square	F
					Between groups			
					Within groups			
Sex	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	[illegible]
Interaction of sex and [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Interaction of sex and [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Interaction of sex and [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Correlational Hypotheses

Hypotheses 4-6 predicted a significant gain-score correlation between the various dependent variables for which significant gains were predicted in Hypotheses 1-3. Table X shows all the data.

Information Gain/Attitude Change.--There is a greater correlation between information gain and attitude change scores for JCOC as compared to non-JCOC (+.23 vs. -.18). This supports Hypothesis 4a, and the results are statistically significant. Since main effects were found (above) for each of these measures, this finding is an important one for this study, and corroborates the Douglas et al. results.[3]

Information Gain/Opinion Change.--The correlations between these scores are -.06 for JCOC and .08 for non-JCOC. This is neither significant nor supportive of Hypothesis 4b, which is not very meaningful at this point anyway, due to the failure to find significant opinion effects (above).

Attitude Change/Behavior Change.--The correlations are .02 for JCOC, and -.25 for non-JCOC. This technically does support Hypothesis 5a, to a barely significant degree,

---

[3]Douglas, et al., op. cit.

Conclusions Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1-4 predicted a significant pair-score correlation between the various hypothesis variables for which significance value were predicted in Hypotheses 1-4. Table 4 shows all the data.

Information Seeking/Attitude Change.--There is a greater correlation between information gain and attitude change scores for JCDC as compared to non-JCDC (r=.22 vs. -.18). This supports Hypothesis 4a, and the results are statistically significant. Since only 4 cases were found (above) for each of these measures, this finding is an important one for this study, and corroborates the Douglas et al. results.[3]

Information Assimilation Change.--The correlations between these scores are -.08 for JCDC and .04 for non-JCDC. This is neither significant nor supportive of Hypothesis 4b, which is not very meaningful at this point however, due to the failure in that significant operant affects lowered.

Initial Conversation Change.--The correlations are .02 for JCDC, and -.21 for non-JCDC. This tentatively does support Hypothesis 4c, in a barely significant direction.

---

[3] Douglas, et al., op. cit.

TABLE X

CORRELATION MATRIX

	JCOC	Non-JCOC	JCOC Net	z	p
Information gain/ Attitude change	.228	-.176	+.404	1.81	.04 (1-tail)
Information gain/ Opinion change	-.059	.083	-.142	<1	n.s.
Attitude change/ Behavior change	.021	-.252	+.273	1.23	.11
Opinion change/ Behavior change	-.147	-.158	+.011	<1	n.s.
Information gain/ Behavior change	.173	.186	-.013	<1	n.s.
	(N=37)	(N=49)			
Attitude change/ Opinion change (non-hypothesis)	.035	.435	-.400	1.77	.08 (2-tail)

TABLE 8

COMPLETING MATRIX

		[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Information gain/ Attitude change
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Information gain/ Opinion change
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Attitude change/ Behavior change
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Opinion change/ Behavior change
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Information gain/ Behavior change
			[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Attitude change/ Opinion change (non-hierarchic)

although the correlation within the JCOC group is essentially zero and the behavior measures of the two groups are not comparable (see above).

Opinion Change/Behavior Change.--Since neither of these measures could be shown as a significant main effect (above), Hypothesis 5b becomes rather meaningless. For the record, the correlations for both groups are negative, and there is no appreciable difference between them.

Information Gain/Behavior Change.--Examination of these scores similarly shows no significant difference between the two groups. There is a tendency for greater information increments to be associated with military speech-making, about equally irrespective of JCOC participation.

While there was no stated hypothesis regarding the correlation between attitude change and opinion change scores, it is perhaps noteworthy that the data (Table X) indicate a greater correlation for the non-JCOC group between these scores. The JCOC score was .04 and the non-JCOC score was .44. The resultant net of .40 for non-JCOC is statistically significant, and is reminiscent of the greater inter-item opinion correlations in the non-JCOC group, as reported above. Again, the JCOC participation is associated with a tendency to avoid stereotyped opinion responses.

although the correlations within the DDC items is reasonably high and the indicated reliability of the two groups are not significantly lower.

Relation Between Behavior Ratings.—Since neither of these measures could be shown to a significant extent (above), significants to measure student behavior. For the record, the correlations for both groups are negative, and there is no dependable relationship between them.

Relationship between Groups.—Examination of these measures similarly shows no significant difference between the two groups. There is a tendency for parents' information interviews to be associated with ability speech-reading, shown especially in regularity of DDC participation.

Only there was no marked hypothesis regarding the correlation between attitude change and overall change score, it is perhaps noteworthy that the data tends to indicate a greater correlation for the non-DDC group between these measures. The DDC score was .31 and the non-DDC score was .41. The resultant net of .42 for non-DDC is practically significant, and is consistent of the greater inter-item opinion correlation in the non-DDC group, as reported above. Again, the DDC participation is associated with a tendency to avoid interpersonal opinion disagreement.

When one considers that the behavior measure was insufficient for this study, perhaps the most explicit finding with regard to Hypotheses 4-6 is that opinion change occurred independently of either information gain or attitude change, for those who attended the JCOC. Again, it may well be that a ceiling effect was at work regarding some specific opinion items, and that JCOC was irrelevant to others.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this research paper do not provide a satisfactory answer to the question: Is the JCOC an effective program? The conference did stimulate an increased knowledge of military matters among the participants when compared to the non-participant group. Likewise, a favorable attitude change was indicated by the semantic differential for the JCOC group. However, in neither case do the data indicate gains substantial enough to justify the program for the purposes of either building knowledge or changing attitudes. With regard to the latter, it would appear that if the intent of the JCOC is to change attitudes, it is addressing itself to the wrong group, inasmuch as the attitudes of the participants were very favorable prior to the conference.

It is recognized that neither stimulating greater knowledge about the military nor the changing of attitudes more favorably toward it are explicitly stated objectives of the JCOC. The "official" objectives previously cited in Chapter II are quite general, even nebulous, and no attempt was made in this study to ascertain whether or not they were

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this research paper do not provide a satisfactory answer to the question is the ODOC an effective program? The results did indicate an increased knowledge of military matters among the participants when compared to the nonparticipant group. Likewise, a favorable attitude change was indicated by the essential differentials for the ODOC group. However, in neither case do the data indicate data substantial enough to justify the program for the purposes of either building knowledge or changing attitudes. With regard to the latter, it would appear that if the lessons of the ODOC is to change anti-rebs, it is encouraging insofar as the young group, measured as the attitudes of the participants were very favorable prior to the conference.

It is concluded that neither substantive greater knowledge about the military nor the changing of attitudes made favorably toward it are sufficiently strong objectives of the ODOC. The "political" objectives particularly stand to suggest if any data general, open positions, and no attempt was made to gain verify or measurable whether or not they were

accomplished. It is, in fact, hard to imagine how such a study could be conducted.

Perhaps a more relevant (though unstated) objective of the conference lies in its utility in providing candidates for membership in the Defense Orientation Conference Association (DOCA), the "alumni organization" of JCOC. As of January 15, 1971, 31 of the 37 JCOC respondents to this study had joined DOCA. That is a very impressive "behavior" index and would have been included as such in this study if a comparable measure had been available in the non-JCOC group.

Further, it must be recognized that perhaps this study did not transcend the self-selection bias recognized from the start, and therefore, never quite penetrated to the pith of reliable evaluative research with regard to the JCOC. A replication of this study, eliminating the self-selection bias, would seem to be a worthwhile undertaking. It is suggested that the Defense Department consider such an endeavor since the wherewithal for its conduct is probably not available to the individual researcher. A replication would require that a larger roster of potential JCOC participants be compiled, possibly on a matched-pairs basis, and invitations then be issued to a random sample of one-half of the names on the list. Only a procedure of this sort could provide the truly experimental data needed for a conclusive evaluation of the conference.

accomplishing. It is, in fact, hard to imagine how such a study could be conducted.

Perhaps a more relevant (though admittedly subjective) of the conference line is less reality in providing substance for membership in the Indiana Organizational Development Association (IAOD), the "Indiana Organization" of IAOD. As of January 15, 1971, 31 of the 37 (one) respondents to this study had joined IAOD. This is a very impressive "membership" index and would have been indicated as such in this study if a comparable measure had been available in the non-IAOD group.

Further, it must be recognized that perhaps this study did not examine the self-selection that occurred from the start, and therefore, never quite penetrated to the pool of reliable evaluative measures which ought to be IAOD. A replication of this study, eliminating the self-selection bias, would seem to be a worthwhile endeavor. It is suggested that the Indiana Organizational Development Association which the observatical for its members is probably not available to the individual researcher. A replication would require that a larger source of potential IAOD participants be sought, possibly on a nationwide-basis basis, and invitations then be issued to a random sample or one-half of the members on the list. Only a procedure of this sort could provide the truly experimental data needed for a meaningful evaluation of the conference.

Meanwhile, in the absence of conclusive evidence, what can be said of JCOC as a military public relations effort? It is beyond the scope of this study to attempt any kind of cost-benefits analysis, but we can assess the benefits. The least that can be said is that they consist of slight increments of knowledge and attitudes among a few well-placed persons who are already informed and supportive of the military. The most that can be said is that the conference appears to be an effective method of building the DOCA roster, and that it does have demonstrable influences on the thinking of the participants. It would be presumptuous to assert here that these effects are, or are not, worth the cost of JCOC in terms of expenditure of funds, manpower, and political criticism. That is a policy decision that can, hopefully, be aided by the assessment of JCOC's effects that have been made here.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Berelson, Bernard; Paul Lazarsfeld; and William McPhee. Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Cutlip, Scott M. and Allen H. Center. Effective Public Relations. 3d ed. rev. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Farrell, R. Barry (ed.). Approaches To Comparative and International Politics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966.

Fulbright, J. William. The Pentagon Propaganda Machine. New York: Liveright, 1970.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. How To Control the Military. New York: Signet, 1969.

Hovland, Carl I., et al. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

_____. Experiments on Mass Communication. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Hovland, Carl I. "Effects of the Mass Media of Communication," in Gardner Lindzey, Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Insko, Chester A. (ed.). Theories of Attitude Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Kiesler, Charles A., et al. Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

Bastiaan, Herman, Paul Lazarsfeld, and William Wolfe. _Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign._ Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Cantril, Hadley, A. and Gordon W. Allport. _Psychology Applied to Daily Living._ 3d ed. rev. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Farrell, R. Barry (ed.). _Approaches to Comparative and International Politics._ Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966.

Fulbright, J. William. _The Pentagon Propaganda Machine._ New York: Liveright, 1970.

Hope, H. L. (ed.). _Handbook of Research on Teaching._ Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Kainerstorfer, Jane Bennett. _How to Control the Military._ New York: Dupont, 1969.

Mayland, Carl I., et al. _Communication and Persuasion._ New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

_____. _Experiments on Mass Communication._ Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Mayland, Carl I. "Effects of the Mass Media of Communication," in Handbook Lindzey, _Handbook of Social Psychology._ Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Ruebe, Chester L. (ed.). _Theories of Activists Change._ New Haven: Syracuse-Centry-Crofts, 1967.

Sherif, Carolyn W., et al. _Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches._ New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Klapper, Joseph T. The Effects of Mass Communication. New York: The Free Press, 1960.

McNemar, Quinn. Psychological Statistics. 3d ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

National Opinion Research Center. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.). Class, Status and Power. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.

Osgood, Charles E., et al. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Schramm, Wilbur (ed.). The Science of Human Communication. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Smith, M. Brewster; Jerome S. Bruner; and Robert W. White. Opinions and Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.

B. Articles

Carter, Richard F.; W. Lee Ruggels; and Steven H. Chaffee. "The Semantic Differential in Opinion Measurement," Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter 1968-1969.

Chaffee, Steven H. and Jack M. McLeod. "Sensitization in Panel Design: A Coorientational Experiment," Journalism Quarterly, Winter 1968.

Douglas, Dorothy F.; Bruce H. Westley; and Steven H. Chaffee. "An Information Campaign That Changed Community Attitudes," Journalism Quarterly, Autumn 1970.

Greenberg, Bradley S. "On Relating Attitude Change and Information Gain," Journal of Communication, September 1964.

Hyman, Herbert H. and Paul B. Sheatsley. "Some Reasons Why Information Campaigns Fail," Public Opinion Quarterly, Fall 1947.

Manning, Robert. (Untitled) The Atlantic, February 1970.

Rochester, Dean D. "Persistence of Attitudes and Values of NDEA Students--Two Years Post Institute." Counselor Education and Supervision, Spring 1970.

Star, Shirley A. and Helen MacGill Hughes. "A Report on an Educational Campaign: The Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations," American Journal of Sociology, January 1950.

Schramm, Wilbur, and Richard F. Carter. "Effectiveness of a Political Telethon," Public Opinion Quarterly, Spring 1959.

C. U. S. Government Sources

Joint Civilian Orientation Conference File--General. Office of Director of Community Relations Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Room 1D760, Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

Press Release, Office of Senator William Proxmire, March 22, 1970.

U. S. Navy Public Affairs Regulations Rev. 12-65; Washington, D. C.: U. S. Navy Office of Information, 1965.

D. Reference Works

Who's Who In America. Chicago: Marquis, Vol. 36, 1970.

E. Unpublished Works

Mounce, Claude E. "An Analysis of the Secretary of the Navy Guest Cruise Program." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Public Communication, Division of Public Relations, Boston University, 1966.

Goodwater, Alan D. "Problems of Morients and Values of Black Students—Two Basic First Meeting." Counselor Education and Supervision, Spring 1970.

Hoe, Gilfry H. and Ruth Mandil Mayne. "A Report on a Educational Campaign: The Classroom Film for the Twelve Months." Teaching Models of Sociology, January 1970.

Johnson, William, and Anthony J. Barrar. "Effectiveness of a Multiethnic Training." Public Opinion Quarterly, Spring 1970.

E. H. H. Government Service

John Carlisle Delaneville Conference File—General. Office of Director of Community Relations Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. June 1970/ Pamphlet, Washington, D. C.

Press Release, Office of Secretary Military Personnel, March 24, 1970.

U. S. Army Public Affairs Regulations Nov. 12-40; Washington, D. C.: U. S. Army Office of Information, 1962.

F. Autobiographical Data

Don'e Use In Anecdote. Chicago: Ravenale, Vol. 24, 1970.

G. Unpublished Works

Mason, Clarke H. "An Analysis of the Recovery of the Step Away Drugs Program." Unpublished Master's Thesis, School of Public Innovation, Division of Public Relations, Marvin University, 1964.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE #1

COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY

Note: This is an anonymous questionnaire. The answers are only to be used in a statistical analysis. Nothing will be connected with your name. Returned questionnaires will be destroyed after analysis. There is a space for your comments at the end of the questionnaire. The success of this study depends upon complete responses from everyone.

1. In general, how would you describe the attitude of the people in your community toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

   ___Very favorable ___Moderately favorable ___No opinion

   ___Moderately unfavorable ___Very unfavorable

2. What is your personal attitude toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

   ___Very favorable ___Moderately favorable ___No opinion

   ___Moderately unfavorable ___Very unfavorable

3. Is there a U. S. military installation located in your community?

   ___No ___Yes (please name installation):_____

4. How do you get most of your information about the U. S. military? (Indicate the three most important sources by marking "1," "2," and "3.")

   ___Daily Newspapers ___Television

   ___News magazines ___Books

   ___Other magazines ___Public speeches

   ___Radio ___Other (please specify):_____

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE #1

COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY

Dear: This is an anonymous questionnaire. The answers are only to be used in a statistical analysis. Mailing will be conducted with your name. Returned questionnaires will be destroyed after analysis. There is a space for your comments at the end of the questionnaire. The success of this study depends upon complete responses from everyone.

1. In general, how would you describe the attitude of the people in your community toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

___Very favorable	___Moderately favorable	___No opinion
___Moderately unfavorable	___Very unfavorable	

2. What is your personal attitude toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

___Very favorable	___Moderately favorable	___No opinion
___Moderately unfavorable	___Very unfavorable	

3. Is there a U. S. military installation located in your community?

___Yes ___No (please name location)._____

4. How do you get most of your information about the U. S. military? (Indicate the three most important sources by marking "1," "2," and "3.")

___Daily Newspapers	___Television
___News magazines	___Radio
___Other periodicals	___Public speaking
___Radio	___Other (please specify)._____

5. Please rate on a one-to-seven scale how sufficiently informed you feel you are about U. S. military activities. One is "not at all informed," while seven is "very well informed."

Not at all informed						Very well informed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. Have you served in any of the U. S. Armed Services?

___No ___Yes

If yes, Branch of Service:_____; From_____To_____

7. Do you currently have any official affiliation with any of the military services? ___No ___Yes (specify affiliation):_____

8. If your son, or another young man close to you, asked your advice on which service to join, which one would you most likely recommend?

___Army ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

___None

9. Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces leads to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?

___More ___Less ___Has no effect

10. Why do you feel this way?_____

_____

11. Which one of the Armed Forces do you think has the most troops in Vietnam? ___Army ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

12. About what percentage of the nation's budget is presently being allocated to defense spending?

___20% ___40% ___60% ___80%

13. About how many American troops are presently in Vietnam?

___25,000 ___450,000 ___650,000 ___850,000

5. Please rate us a convenient scale how satisfactorily informed you feel you are about U. S. military activities. (On is "not at all informed," while seven is "very well informed."

Not at all informed						Very well informed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. Have you served in any of the U. S. Armed Services?

___No ___Yes

If yes, branch of service_____; from_____To_____

7. Do you currently have any national affiliation with one of the military services? ___No ___Yes (specify affiliation)_____

8. If your son, or another young man close to you, signed your advice on which service to join which one would you lean likely recommend?

___Army ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

___Don't

9. Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces tends to make or to have made significant contribution in their civilian life?

___Yes ___Some ___Not in either

10. Why do you feel this way?_____

_____

11. Which one of the Armed Forces do you think has the most image in America? ___Army ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

12. About what percentage of the nation's budget is presently being allocated to defense spending?

___30% ___50% ___60% ___80%

13. About how many American troops are presently in Vietnam?

___10,000 ___40,000 ___200,000 ___400,000

14. Who is the present Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee?

___Carl Albert ___Edward Hebert ___Wilbur Mills

___Mendel Rivers

15. How many general officers have been killed in Vietnam?

___None ___One ___Three ___Five

16. Please rate on a one-to-seven scale the following words on how well they describe the U. S. Armed Forces, in your opinion:

a. Dedicated	Very dedicated					Not at all dedicated	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Disciplined	Very well disciplined				Not at all well disciplined		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Disorganized	Very disorganized					Not at all disorganized	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Efficient	Very efficient					Not at all efficient	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Incompetent	Very incompetent					Not at all incompetent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Irresolute	Very irresolute					Not at all irresolute	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. Modern	Very modern					Not at all modern	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. Unprofessional	Very unprofessional				Not at all unprofessional		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. Numerous statements have been made recently about the U. S. military by members of the mass media, Congressional leaders, and others. Please indicate your opinion on the following:

14. Who is the present Governor of the Bonga Island Province (Province)?

___Earl Albert ___Edward Albert ___Wilfred Wills

___Donald Steele

15. How many general elections have been held in Vierzaar?

___None ___One ___Three ___Five

16. Please rate on a conservative scale the following words as how well they describe the U. S. Armed Forces, in your opinion:

a. Patriotic	Very unpatriotic						Not at all unpatriotic
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Disciplined	Very well disciplined						Not at all well disciplined
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Disorganized	Very disorganized						Not at all disorganized
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Efficient	Very efficient						Not at all efficient
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Adaptable	Very inadaptable						Not at all inadaptable
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Innovation	Very innovative						Not at all innovative
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. Modern	Very modern						Not at all modern
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. Professional	Very unprofessional						Not at all unprofessional
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. Everyone citizenship has been very recently about the U. S. military by members of the news media, Congressional leaders, and others. Please indicate your opinion on the coverage:

a. The military budget should be drastically reduced.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

b. Further development and deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) is essential to the national security.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

c. The military is distorting the truth by denying the presence of American combat forces in Laos.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

d. America's foremost position as a world leader is dependent upon the maintenance of vigorous and viable Armed Forces.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

e. The American military man in Vietnam is unsurpassed in fighting skill, determination, and courage under fire.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

4. The military budget should be drastically reduced.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

5. Further development and deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) is essential to the national security.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

6. The military is increasing the crisis by keeping the presence of American combat forces in Laos.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

7. Australia's foreign position as a world leader is dependent upon the maintenance of vigorous and viable armed forces.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

8. The American military can be Vietnam is unnecessary in diverting moral, economically, and manpower units.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

f. The American military services have a vested interest in continuing the Vietnam War.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

18. Listed below in alphabetical order are eight occupations. How much status do you accord to these occupations? Please indicate the one to which you accord the most status by marking the number "1" by it; mark a "2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Rank each of the occupations, so that you will mark an "8" by the one you regard the least.

___Bookkeeper ___Minister/priest

___Farmer ___Physician

___Military enlisted man ___Public school teacher

___Military officer ___Radio/TV announcer

19. What three living Americans do you most admire?

a._____ b._____ c._____

20. Listed below are various civic and political activities. Please check those in which you have participated at any time during the last six months.

___Worker in a civic activity (e.g., Community Chest, Red Cross, P.T.A., civic club, scouting, etc.).

___Active in community cultural activity (e.g., art, concerts, theater).

___Active in church work or church-connected group.

___Candidate for political office.

___Contributed money to a political party or candidate.

___Active in other civic or political activity (please specify):

_____

_____

6. The Brazilian military employs born a general
Lazaro in commenting the vietnam war.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

18. Listed below is eighteen-ideal order are eight occupa-
tions. Many such occupa do you accord to these occupa-
tions? Please indicate the one to which you accord the
most status by entering the number "1" by its name a
"2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Rank
each of the occupations, so that you will name an "18"
by the one you regard the least.

___Businessman ___Minister/priest

___Farmer ___Physician

___Military noncommissioned man ___Public school teacher

___Military officer ___Senator/US Congressman

19. What three living Americans do you most admire?

1._____ 2._____ 3._____

20. Listed below are various civic and political activities.
Please check those which you have participated in
any time during the last six months.

___Member in a civic activity (e.g., Community Chest,
Red Cross, P.T.A., civic club, meeting, etc.).

___Active in community military service (e.g., Am.
Legion, Guard).

___Help in church work or church-sponsored group.

___Campaign for political office.

___Contribute money to a political party or candidate.

___Active in other civic or political activity (please
specify)

_____

_____

21. About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months? _____

    Were any of them on a military subject? ___No ___Yes (how many): _____

22. What is your date of birth? _____

23. What is your occupation? _____

24. What was the highest grade of school or year of college that you completed?

    _____School, or _____College

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE.

The following space is provided for any comments you wish to make about the U. S. Armed Forces, this survey, etc. Use the back of the page for your comments if needed.

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. Does one enjoy public speaking [illegible] you [illegible] in the last six months? _____

Have any of them on a military uniform? ___Yes ___No
[illegible]? _____

22. What is your area of [illegible]? _____

23. What is your occupation? _____

24. What was the highest grade of school or year of college that you completed?

_____School, or _____College

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. PLEASE REVIEW THE COMPLETED INSTRUMENTS IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE.

The following space is provided for any comments you wish to make about this [illegible]. Please [illegible], file survey, [illegible] the back of the page for your comments if needed.

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE #1

LCDR Dale K. Patterson
806 Schumann Street
Sun Prairie, Wis. 53590
April 6, 1970

Dear Sir:

Enclosed with this letter you will find a questionnaire which requests your opinion regarding various aspects of the U. S. Armed Forces and related matters. Your name was selected because of your position of leadership in your community.

I am a Navy officer currently working toward a master's degree in journalism. The enclosed questionnaire is part of a research project I am conducting at the University of Wisconsin. This study will help me meet the academic requirements for an advanced degree, and ultimately I am hopeful that it will assist the U. S. Armed Forces in improving their community relations programs. However, this study is in no way officially connected with any agency of the Department of Defense.

Although I realize that you are extremely busy, I would be most grateful if you would take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. The success of my study depends on your cooperation.

Your assistance in completing the questionnaire and returning it in the envelope provided by April 20 would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dale K. Patterson
LCDR, USN

APPENDIX B

LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRES AT

Lieu Dale E. Fritzsche
806 Schwartz Street
Eau Pleiria, Wis. 53590
April 8, 1970

Dear Sir:

Enclosed with this letter you will find a questionnaire which requests your opinion concerning various aspects of the U. S. Armed Forces and military medicine. Your name was selected because of your position of leadership in your community.

I am a Army officer currently working toward a master's degree in journalism. The enclosed questionnaire is part of a research project I am conducting at the University of Wisconsin. This study will help me meet the academic requirements for an advanced degree, and ultimately I am hopeful that it will assist the U. S. Armed Forces in improving their community relations program. However, this study is in no way officially connected with any agency of the Department of Defense.

Although I realize that you are extremely busy, I would be most grateful if you would take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. The success of my study depends on your cooperation.

Your assistance in completing the questionnaire and returning it in the envelope provided by April 20 would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dale E. Fritzsche
1Lt, USA

APPENDIX C

POSTCARD FOLLOW-UP TO QUESTIONNAIRE #1

April 9, 1970

Dear Sir:

A day or two ago you should have received a questionnaire, "Community Leader Survey," in the mail from me. If you have not already done so, would you please complete it and return it to me as soon as possible?

The success of my study is totally dependent upon your cooperation. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dale K. Patterson
LCDR, USN

APPENDIX E

REPORTING POLICIES TO CONTRIBUTORS AT

April 9, 1970

Dear Sir:

A day or two ago you should have received a questionnaire, "Community Leaders Survey," in the mail from us. If you have not already done so, would you please complete it and return it to us as soon as possible?

The success of my study in totally dependent upon your cooperation. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Eric T. Pedersen
LCDR, USN

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE #2

COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY

Note: This is an anonymous questionnaire. The answers are only to be used in a statistical analysis. Nothing will be connected with your name. Returned questionnaires will be destroyed after analysis. There is a space for your comments at the end of the questionnaire. The success of this study depends upon complete responses from everyone.

1. In general, how would you describe the attitude of the people in your community toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

   ___Very favorable ___Moderately favorable ___No opinion

   ___Moderately unfavorable ___Very unfavorable

2. What is your personal attitude toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

   ___Very favorable ___Moderately favorable ___No opinion

   ___Moderately unfavorable ___Very unfavorable

3. Is there a U. S. military installation located in your community?

   ___No ___Yes (please name installation):_____

4. How do you get most of your information about the U. S. military? (Indicate the three most important sources by marking "1," "2," and "3").

   ___Daily newspapers ___Television

   ___News magazines ___Books

   ___Other magazines ___Public speeches

   ___Radio ___Other (please specify):

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE #2

COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY

Note: This is an anonymous questionnaire. The answers are only to be used in a statistical analysis. Nothing will be connected with your name. Returned questionnaires will be destroyed after analysis. There is a space for your comments at the end of the questionnaire. The success of this study depends upon complete cooperation from everyone.

1. In general, how would you describe the attitudes of the people in your community toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

___Very favorable ___Moderately favorable ___Indifferent

___Moderately unfavorable ___Very unfavorable

2. What is your personal attitude toward the U. S. Armed Forces?

___Very favorable ___Moderately favorable ___No opinion

___Moderately unfavorable ___Very unfavorable

3. Is there a U. S. military installation located in your community?

___No ___Yes (Please name installation)_____

4. How do you get most of your information about the U. S. military? (Indicate the three most important sources by marking "1," "2," and "3").

___Daily newspaper ___Television

___Home magazine ___Movies

___Other magazine ___Public speaking

___Radio ___Other (please specify)

5. Please rate on a one-to-seven scale how sufficiently informed you feel you are about U. S. military activities. One is "not at all informed," while seven is "very well informed."

Not at all informed						Very well informed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. Have you served in any of the U. S. Armed Services?

___No ___Yes

If yes, Branch of Service:_____; From_____To_____

7. Do you currently have any official affiliation with any of the military services? ___No ___Yes (specify affiliation):_____

8. If your son, or another young man close to you, asked your advice on which service to join, which one would you most likely recommend?

___Army ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

___None

9. Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces leads to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?

___More ___Less ___Has no effect

10. Why do you feel this way? _____

_____

11. Who is the Commander of the American military forces in Vietnam?

___Gen. Abrams ___Gen. Goodpaster ___Gen. Walt

___Gen. Westmoreland

12. What is the approximate dollar figure of the present U. S. Defense Department's budget?

___$45 billion ___$60 billion ___$75 billion

___$90 billion

5. Please rate on a one-to-seven scale how sufficiently informed you feel you are about U. S. military activities. Use 1 "not at all informed," while seven is "very well informed."

Not at all informed						Very well informed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. Have you served in any of the U. S. Armed Services?

___No ___Yes

If yes, Branch of Service_____; Year_____To_____

7. Do you currently have any military affiliation with any of the military services? ___No ___Yes (specify affiliation)_____

8. If yes, or another young man claims to you, without your advice on which service to join, which one would you most likely recommend?

___Army ___Navy ___Air Force ___Marine Corps

___None

9. Do you feel that serving in one of the Armed Forces tends to more or to less social responsibility in later civilian life?

___More ___Less ___Has no effect

10. Why do you feel this way? _____

_____

11. Who is the commander of the American military forces in Vietnam?

___Gen. Abrams ___Gen. Westmoreland ___Gen. Weir

___Gen. Westmoreland

12. What is the approximate active figure of the present U. S. Defense Department's budget?

___$45 billion ___$60 billion ___$75 billion

___$90 billion

13. Approximately how many U. S. military personnel have been killed in the war in Vietnam?

___23,000 ___28,000 ___36,000 ___43,000

14. Who is the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee?

___Henry Jackson ___Mike Mansfield

___Richard Russell ___John Stennis

15. What is the approximate combined total strength of the U. S. Armed Forces?

___2.4 million ___2.6 million ___2.8 million

___3 million

16. Please rate on a one-to-seven scale the following words on how well they describe the U. S. Armed Forces, in your opinion:

a. Competent	Very competent						Not at all competent
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Indifferent	Very indifferent						Not at all indifferent
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Inefficient	Very inefficient						Not at all inefficient
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Old-fashioned	Very old-fashioned						Not at all old-fashioned
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Organized	Very well organized						Not at all well organized
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Professional	Very professional						Not at all professional
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. Resolute	Very resolute						Not at all resolute
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. Approximately how many U. S. military personnel have been killed in the war in Vietnam?

___21,000 ___28,000 ___34,000 ___42,000

14. Who is the President of the Peace Corps Service?

___Harry Truman ___Mike Mansfield

___Richard Russell ___John Sherman

15. What is the appropriation contained naval aircraft on the U. S. Naval Project?

___2.4 million ___3.6 million ___1.2 million

___3 million

16. Please rate on a one-to-seven scale the following groups on how well they handle the U. S. Naval Project. Is your opinion

a. Democrats	very incompetent 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all competent 7
b. Republicans	very incompetent 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all incompetent 7
c. Legislators	very incompetent 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all incompetent 7
d. Anti-Semitic	very anti-Semitic 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all anti-Semitic 7
e. Politicians	very well organized 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all well organized 7
f. Scientists	very professional 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all professional 7
g. Economists	very competent 1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all competent 7

	Very undisciplined				Not at all undisciplined		
h. Undisciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. Numerous statements have been made recently about the U. S. military by members of the mass media, Congressional leaders, and others. Please indicate your opinion on the following:

a. The military budget should be drastically reduced.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

b. Further development and deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) is essential to the national security.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

c. The military is distorting the truth by claiming that American air support for Cambodian military operations is mainly to reduce American casualties in Vietnam.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

d. America's foremost position as a world leader is dependent upon the maintenance of vigorous and viable Armed Forces.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

5. Qualifications: Very qualified 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all qualified

17. Numerous statements have been made recently about the U. S. military by members of the news media, congressional leaders, and others. Please indicate your opinion on the following:

a. The military budget should be drastically reduced.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

b. Further development and deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) is essential to the national security.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

c. The military is distorting the news by claiming that American air support for Cambodian military operations is mainly to reduce American casualties in Vietnam.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

d. America's foremost position as a world leader is dependent upon the maintenance of vigorous and viable armed forces.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

e. The American military man in Vietnam is unsurpassed in fighting skill, determination, and courage under fire.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

f. The American military services have a vested interest in continuing the Vietnam War.

___Strongly agree ___Moderately agree ___No opinion

___Moderately disagree ___Strongly disagree

18. Listed below in alphabetical order are eight occupations. How much status do you accord to these occupations? Please indicate the one to which you accord the most status by marking the number "1" by it; mark a "2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Please rank <u>each</u> of the occupations, so that you will mark an "8" by the one you regard the least:

___Farm owner ___Minister/priest

___Insurance agent ___Newspaper reporter

___Military enlisted man ___Scientist

___Military officer ___Social worker

19. What three living Americans do you most admire?

A._____ B._____ C._____

20. Listed below are various civic and political activities. Please check those in which you have participated at any time during the last six months.

___Worker in a civic activity (e.g., Community Chest, Red Cross, P.T.A., civic club, Chamber of Commerce, scouting, etc.).

___Active in community cultural activity (e.g., art, concerts, theater).

___Active in church work or church-connected group.

7. The American military can in Vietnam be characterized in dispute with: determination, and courage under fire.

___Strongly agree	___Moderately agree	___So doubtful
___Moderately disagree	___Strongly disagree	

8. The American military services have a vested interest in controlling the Vietnam War.

___Strongly agree	___Moderately agree	___So opinion
___Moderately disagree	___Strongly disagree	

18. Listed below are significant order are eight occupations. How much status do you accord to these occupations? Please indicate the one to which you accord the most status by marking the number "1" by it; mark a "2" by the one you regard second most, and so on. Please rank each of the occupations, so that you will mark an "8" by the one you regard the lowest.

___Film owner	___Military/Navy
___Industrial expert	___Newspaper reporter
___Military enlisted man	___Scientist
___Military officer	___Social worker

19. What major issue facing Americans do you most endorse?

1._____ 2._____ 3._____

20. Listed below are various ways we participate activities. Please check those in which you have participated at any time during the last six months.

___Member in a civic activity (e.g., Community Chest, Red Cross, P.T.A., civic club, Chamber of Commerce, security, etc).

___Active in community cultural activity (e.g., art, concerts, theater).

___Active in church work or church-connected group.

___Candidate for political office.

___Contributed money to a political party or candidate.

___Active in other civic or political activity (Please specify):

_____

_____

21. About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months? _____

    How many of them were on a military subject?_____

22. What is your date of birth? _____

23. What is your occupation? _____

    Your father's occupation? _____

24. What was the highest grade of school or year of college that you completed?

    ___School, or ___College

25. During the past six months, what events, incidents or experiences have influenced you to respond to this questionnaire in the manner in which you have?

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE.

The following space is provided for any comments you wish to make about the U. S. Armed Forces, this survey, etc. Use the back of the page for your comments if desired.

_____

_____

_____

___Contributed time to political action.

___Contributed money to a political party or candidate.

___Active in other civic or political activity
(Please specify):

_____

_____

31. About how many public speeches have you made in the last six months? _____

How many of them were on a military subject_____

32. What is your date of birth? _____

33. What is your occupation? _____

Your father's occupation? _____

34. What was the highest grade of school or year of college that you completed?

___School, or ___College

35. During the past six months, what events, institutions or experiences have influenced you to respond to this questionnaire in the manner in which you have?

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. PLEASE EXPRESS YOUR CONCERNING CONSTRUCTIVE RATIO IN YOUR EXPERIENCE CONCERNING.

The following space is provided for any comments you wish to make about the U. S. Armed Forces, this survey, etc. Use the back of the page for your comments if desired.

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE #2

LCDR Dale K. Patterson
806 Schumann Street
Sun Prairie, Wis.
53590
October 6, 1970

Dear Sir:

You were extremely kind in assisting me last April by completing and returning a questionnaire which reflected your opinion regarding various aspects of the U. S. Armed Forces. You will recall that I am a naval officer working toward a master's degree at the University of Wisconsin.

As a result of your cooperation I have been able to compile an excellent set of data on the attitudes of community leaders such as yourself toward the military. However, in order to complete my study, I must ask your cooperation once again by completing the enclosed questionnaire. It is quite similar to the one you returned to me six months ago.

Your help in completing the questionnaire and returning it in the envelope provided at your earliest opportunity would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dale K. Patterson
LCDR, USN

APPENDIX 2

LETTER FOR/WITH QUESTIONNAIRE #2

John Dale H. Patterson
4th Jefferson Street
San Fraxiro, Vila.
11222
October 6, 1970

Dear Pat:

You were extremely kind in assisting me last April by completing and returning a questionnaire which indicated your opinion concerning various aspects of the U. A. Armed Forces. You will recall that I am a Naval officer working toward a master's degree in the University of Fraxonia.

As a result of your cooperation I have been able to compile an excellent set of data on the attitudes of community leaders with regard to the military. Everyone to whom I have sent the questionnaire has been cooperative. It is quite apparent that national questions are matters dear to the hearts of the men you selected to be the master sample.

Now help is needed in completing the questionnaire and assuming it is not asking too much of your earlier cooperation, would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dale H. Patterson
USNR, ret

APPENDIX F

POSTCARD FOLLOW-UP TO QUESTIONNAIRE #2

October 13, 1970

Dear Sir:

A few days ago you should have received a questionnaire, "Community Leader Survey," in the mail from me. If you have not already done so, would you please complete it and return it to me as soon as possible?

The success of my study is totally dependent upon your cooperation. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dale K. Patterson
LCDR, USN

Thesis 138081
P2652 Patterson
Attitudinal effects of
a military orientation
conference on community
leaders.